THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXVII.—OCTOBER, 1912—No. 148.

SERVIA AND THE BALKAN CRISIS.

THE outbreak of hostilities in Montenegro on the 8th of October may have momentous results not only for the Balkan Peninsula, but for all Europe, if not in the immediate present, certainly in the nearing future. It means the reopening of that still unsolved *quæstio vexata* of European diplomacy, the Eastern Question, which has long baffled the skill of the ablest statesmen and obsessed the Cabinets of St. Petersburg, Vienna and London like a troublesome spirit. The daring dash for freedom which the brave mountaineers of the little Balkan State made when they boldly threw down the gage of battle and let loose the dogs of war against Turkey was like setting a match to a mine which threatened to blow up the foundations of an empire that has lasted since the Cross went down before the Crescent and Constantinople was captured by the Mahommedans. For the first time in their checkered history the restless races who inhabit the Peninsula were united in a league against the tyrannical power that too long has been allowed to oppress them. With Turkey at war with Italy, a unique opportunity presented itself of striking, with one accord, a big blow for liberty and avenging the wrongs of centuries. Servians and Bulgars, though heretofore hereditary enemies, were united in view of such a crisis which appealed to the patriotism and cherished dreams and ambitions of Slavs and Greeks. The "Sick Man," if not on his deathbed, was, to all seeming, in very enfeebled health, and the phychological moment for giving him his *coup de grace* appeared to have come. Under

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1912, by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

these circumstances it was hard for the plucky peoples of the Balkans, who had so long sorrowed and suffered under the iron despotism of the Porte, to be held in leash by the great powers and warned that, even if successful, after setting their lives upon the cast, prepared to stand the hazard of the die, no change in the existing *status quo* and no accession of territory would be permitted. The Balkan States were to pull the chestnuts out of the fire, but the biggest chestnut of all—Constantinople—was a prize to be reserved for one or other of the great powers which had never run any of the risks of war, never drawn a sword or fired a shot. The end is not yet, but it cannot be very far off, as a glance at the map indicates clearly how the Turk, once the terror of Europe, is being gradually squeezed out of a continent his presence pollutes.

In any adjustment of the balance of power in Southern Europe, Servia is bound to play a prominent part. It has been called the Key of the Balkans. Its history contains many blood-stained pages from the beginning down to the revolting regicide which preceded the advent of King Peter to the insecure throne upon which he is seated by favor of a military revolt, a revolution of the palace, that shocked Europe by its atrocity and by a deed that recalled the darkest of the dark ages.

It was in the sixth and seventh centuries that the Roman Province of Mœsia was first invaded by Servian bands from beyond the Carpathians. Midway in the ninth century, when they had become Christianized, they had their first armed conflict with their hereditary rivals, the Bulgarians—primitively a Tartan tribe speaking a Slavonic dialect—when Tsar Simeon ravaged the country, and, for a time, effaced it as a national entity. Then the Byzantine Emperor swooped down upon Bulgaria and Servia and annexed both. In the eleventh century we find the Servians engaged in a guerrilla war in Montenegro. In the twelfth century Servia began to make history as an organized kingdom, ruled by Stefan Nemanya, who annexed Bosnia in 1169; who was compelled to crawl before the Byzantine Emperor, barefooted and with a halter round his neck, proclaimed his independence in 1185, married his son to a daughter of the Emperor, and in 1195 abdicated and retired to a monastery. His eldest son, Stefan, "the first crowned," was recognized by the Emperor Baldwin as "by the grace of God, King of all Servian lands even to the seacoast." On June 28, 1330, Stefan Urosh broke up the Bulgarian Empire at the battle of Velbuzhd. His son Stefan, surnamed Dushan (Darling), one of the country's historic heroes, in 1340 extended his sway over the greater part of the Balkan Peninsula, and was known by the high-sounding title of "Emperor

of the Romans, Tsar of Macedonia, loving the Christ." This territorial expansion so alarmed the Byzantine Emperor that he formed an offensive alliance with the Ottomans. On Michaelmas Day, 1356, Stefan marched on Constantinople with a force of eighty thousand men; but on the 18th of December, when the vanguard of his army was actually at the gates of the capital, he died.

From this epoch dates the decadence of the old Servian Empire which fell, never to rise, at the famous battle of Kosovo (June 15, 1389)—"the field of the blackbirds," where Lazar, the last Servian Tsar, the hero of innumerable patriotic legends and ballad poetry, made a last stand and perished[1] along with his nine brothers-in-law and the élite of the Servian aristocracy. Black crows, it is said, brought the news of his defeat and the downfall of his Empire to the Tsarina Militsa as she sat watching in her tower at Krushevats, hoping for the triumphal return of her liege lord. This battle is still the theme of every Servian hymn, and Montenegrins still wear black bands on their caps in mourning for the defeat. The victor, the Sultan Murad, was slain in his tent after the battle by Milosch Obilitch, Lazar's son-in-law, who is to this day popularly regarded as a patriotic hero, for he was hewn to pieces by the Sultan's guards. Murad's tomb is still to be seen at Kossovo.

For seventy years their Turkish conquerors permitted Servian chiefs to exercise nominal power. In 1440 Servia was governed by a Pasha. John Hunyad, called "the white Knight of Wallachia" on account of his silvery armor, struck the last blow for independence, and the treaty of Szegedin in 1444 secured the evacuation of Servia by the Turks. But it was only for a time, for in 1463 all Servians had either submitted to the Ottomans or emigrated to Hungary. It was destined to long remain in subjection to the Porte.

"A sketch of Servian history during the Turkish dominion," says a recent writer,[2] "would be strangely incomplete without a reference to Marko Kraljevich, who is the Slav Cid or King Arthur, the hero of innumerable legends which vividly portray the national ideals. Kraljevich means 'king's son,' the King in question being Vukashin, who supplanted Urosh, son of Dushan. Marko protested against this act of disloyalty, whereupon Vukashin cursed him, praying that he might have neither tomb nor posterity and might be doomed to serve the 'Tsar of the Turks.' But Urosh blessed him and prayed that he might know no equal in wisdom and

[1] The Turkish Sultan with his dying breath ordered his execution after he had been taken prisoner.

[2] "The Servian Tragedy," by Herbert Vivian, M. A.

prowess and that his name might everywhere he celebrated as long as sun and moon should endure. 'Thus they spake, and thus it came to pass,' is the commentary of an old Servian pesma (ballad). Marko fought in the Sultan's armies, but the Sultan feared him, 'for the wrath of Marko was terrible,' and though the peerless knight has no known sepulchre, he lived, if legends may be trusted, for three hundred years; he still lives in the heart of every patriotic Servian, and there are many who believe that he will awake one day from his long sleep and come forth to restore the glories of the ancient empire. Every year, on the anniversary of his slava (the Servian family festival) he may still be seen near a little chapel in the vilayet of Kosovo, careering the forests on his faithful skewbald charger Sharato, who bore him through all his famous campaigns. It is significant of Servia's attitude towards the Turks that Marko should remain her prominent hero, despite his prowess in the service of the Sultan. Turkish suzerainty was regarded as the lesser of two evils, and, in accepting it, Marko was merely an exponent of the spirit of his age. Moreover, the haze of legend has transfigured him, and it is impossible to criticize too closely the political morality of one who slew dragons and vampires, became blood-brother to a vila or wood-nymph, and may almost be numbered among the hajdutsi (outlaws)."

Towards the close of the eighteenth century an Austrian army overran Servia. In 1804 the Turkish Janissaries killed the Pasha of Servia and massacred nearly every leading Servian. One of the few who escaped to the mountains was George Petrovich, known to history as Kara or Black George, whose grandson is the reigning sovereign of Servia. He was a singular character, half hero, half brigand, at once chivalrous and sanguinary, as brave, as brutal and as bizarre as any mediæval marauding baron or free lance. Originally a peasant, an obscure Shumadian neat-herd from the midst of the forests, he joined the Austrian raiders. Outlawed until peace was restored, he became a pig-breeder and drove a lucrative trade with the Austrians on the frontier, until the Janissaries sought to kill him. Gathering round him a band of hardy mountaineers, he organized the country, arming his followers with scythes and pitchforks, and as commander of the Servians, their supreme chief, engaged the Janissaries in a pitched battle and defeated them; captured the fortress of Shabato; invested Belgrade, and, aided by the Pasha of Bosnia, compelled the rebellious Janissaries to submit. Thanked by the Sultan for their loyalty to the Porte and requested to return to their farms, they refused to lay down their arms until given guarantees against the recurrence of massacres. A mission was sent to Constantinople

to propose conditions. The Sultan's reply was to throw all the delegates into prison and send the Pasha of Nish against the armed peasants, to meet with unexpected resistance from Kara George and his ten thousand followers. The affrighted Pasha fled and shortly after died of sheer shame.

Kara George, now master of all the interior of Servia, was able to capture Semendria before the Turks renewed hostilities. When thirty thousand Bosnians crossed the River Kolubara, the Servians disbanded. With the simultaneous appearance of forty thousand Turks on the eastern frontier, it seemed all up with the Servians. But Kara George was not dismayed. A master of guerrilla tactics, with fifteen hundred men he opposed the advance of the Bosnians, who were being shot down by invisible foes, when they concentrated their forces under the walls of Shabato and forced a battle in the neighboring plain of Mishar (August 4, 1806). "Kara George," relates the writer already quoted,[3] "seemed almost superhuman. His colossal figure towered above his comrades, his voice thundered like a hurricane, the sight of his prodigious valor nerved the most timorous. His victory was complete, only a few scattered fugitives being able to escape across the frontier. Meanwhile the Turks in Eastern Servia were being harassed by the usual guerrilla warfare, and when Kara George arrived upon the scene with his triumphant troops, the Pasha offered terms of peace. In October, 1806, the Porte was ready to concede self-government to the Servians, provided her suzerainty were acknowledged and a tribute paid. When, however, the time came to ratify the arrangement, Russia was on the eve of war with Bonaparte, and the Sultan was encouraged to recall his offer. Kara George resolved to continue the war, and on the 13th of December, 1806, he captured Belgrade. Hideous scenes of massacre ensued. The garrison was cut to pieces, despite promises of safe conduct. . . . By the end of 1807 a settled Servian Government had been called into existence. A Senate and a Skupohtina were appointed. But Kara George had a short way with representative bodies which resisted his will. His soldiers received orders to point their muskets through the windows of the Parliament House, and the legislators soon saw the wisdom of reconsidering hasty decisions. In the spring of 1809 he conceived the idea of annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina. He had established his headquarters at Novi-Bazar when he received intelligence of a disaster on the eastern frontier of Servia. One leader refused to succor another in the hour of need; the commander at Nish exploded a powder magazine and sacrificed the whole garrison rather than fall into the hands of the Turks, and

[3] "The Servian Tragedy," Introduction, pp. 7-9.

the victors erected a tower composed of the skulls of their victims. Kara George hastened across Servia with incredible speed, only to find the Servians in a panic. Such was his fury that he ordered his troops to fire upon their compatriots.

"The condition of affairs seemed desperate. The Turks advanced to the centre of the country, spreading devastation in their path. However, Russia came to the rescue, the Turks were driven back, Servia emerged with her independence more secure and her territory extended. But the prestige of Kara George had suffered and the country resented his autocracy. He was, however, very skillful in detaching his leading opponents. Among these was a young man named Milosh Obrenovich. Brought before a tribunal, he refused all concessions, and observed coolly, 'I know that you will not condemn me, for I am beloved of the people.' Kara George took a fancy to him and attached him to his person. In 1811 Kara George was Prince of the Servians with practically unlimited power. Two years later he was a fugitive and an exile, branded with the stigma of cowardice.

"The event which led up to this disaster was the Treaty of Bucharest (May 28, 1812), by which Russia agreed that the Servians should retain self-government, but submit to Turkey. This was interpreted by the Porte to mean a permanent occupation of Servia and a complete disarmament of the Servians. This time the mistake of despising the Servians was not made, and the Grand Vizier took the field in person. Veljko, a former outlaw, bore the brunt of the first onslaught, and only succumbed because Kara George refused him the succor he demanded. Had Kara George been true to his duties and his traditions, the situation might yet have been saved. But he seemed suddenly to have lost his nerve. He hesitated; he retreated; none knew where he was. The whole country, in despair, took up the plaintive refrain of a national ballad, 'Kara George, Kara George, where art thou?' The answer was that he had taken all his portable treasures, buried the rest and fled ignominiously to Austria, abandoning his people to their fate."

This took place on October 13, 1813. The idol had fallen from its pedestal. But why a tyrannical man subject to fits of insane violence, an illiterate peasant who when, during the Austrian raid, he tramped to the frontier with his pigs and his parents, shot his aged father because he refused to cross the Save; who, when his mother tried to cheat him out of a beehive, bonneted her with it and stalked off, regardless of the piercing shrieks she gave at every sting; who, hearing his only brother accused as a gay Lothario, hanged him over his own doorpost with a bridle; who killed

a faithful comrade at a whisper of treachery, and when he found out his mistake cried like a baby; who, grim and black, would sit silently for whole days, gnawing his nails and never uttering a word—why such a man should not only be idolized, but become the founder of a royal dynasty, is one of those incongruities, those anomalies, those strange freaks of fortune which illustrate the oft-repeated aphorism that truth is stranger than fiction.

Both the rival dynasties which have contended for the sovereignty of Servia were founded by peasants. Milosh Obrenovich, founder of the line, the last representative of which was the murdered King Alexander, was the son of Theodore, a poor farm laborer, who had married the widow of a well-to-do peasant named Obren. As a boy he grew up amid pigs and piggeries. He was a swineherd to his father and his half-brother, Milan, with whom he was out in the insurrection of 1804, and when the latter died he assumed the name of Obrenovich, the affix "vich" having the same signification as O or Mac in Ireland. After the mysterious disappearance of Kara George, when the Servians dispersed and he was urged to escape across the frontier, he replied that he could not leave his old mother, his wife and his children to be sold like sheep. A few mountaineers first joined, but soon deserted him. To save his country and his race from annihilation, he lent a willing ear to the Pasha of Belgrade, who invited his coöperation in a work of pacification, for it did not fall in with Turkish policy to exterminate the Servians. "Slim," like the Boers, he temporized, biding his time. Both were opportunists. It suited the Pasha to be conciliatory and Milosh to be pliant. He accepted every mark of favor from the Turkish Satrap, who called him his "adopted son" and helped him to stifle premature risings.

When the hour struck for action, he was the first to give the signal and lead on to victory. Finding that the Pasha was not to be trusted, Milosh fled to the mountains of Rudnik, and on Palm Sunday, 1815, he raised the standard of insurrection at Takovo, which is accordingly known as the cradle of Servian liberty. Arms, which had been hidden away in the forests and mountain caverns, were brought out, and Milosh was soon at the head of a formidable array. The old guerrilla tactics were adopted, women, children and monks transforming themselves into sharpshooters behind every rock. After a series of successful surprises, the insurgents obtained a signal victory on the Kolubara and captured several cannon. Refugees began to return from Austria, and soon Milosh was able to march upon Pozharevato, which was taken after prodigies of valor. When ammunition failed, the Servians fought with their daggers, even with their nails and teeth. Milosh showed himself

as different from Kara George in victory as in distress. The Turks were allowed to depart with the honors of war, and they bore testimony to the care which he lavished upon their wounded. It was not, however, to be expected that the Sultan would submit to the loss of Servia without a struggle. Two armies were sent out: Milosh defeated one, the other made proposals of peace. Just as the leaders of former insurrections had claimed to fight, not against the Sultan, but against his enemies, the Janissaries, so now Milosh complained only of the Pasha's tyranny at Belgrade and protested his fealty to the Sultan. This afforded the Turks a pretext for honorable retreat, and local self-government was promptly conceded, chiefly, perhaps, through fear of Russia. The Pasha, then, had recourse to intrigue, seeking to stir up jealousies against Milosh, who was, however, well able to take care of himself. His most dangerous rival proved to be Kara George, who suddenly returned from Bessarabia, intending to head a fresh insurrection against the Turkish garrisons in Servia. Milosh quickly perceived that such a movement was premature and sent Vuitsa Vulitsevich, an ex-vojvode, to persuade Kara George to stay away. Vuitsa exceeded his instructions, and, finding Kara George obdurate, cut off his head (at Semendria, July 24, 1817) and sent it to Milosh, who was beside himself with grief. The old chief was buried with much solemnity at Topola, and Milosh's wife accompanied the remains for several days' journey on their way to the grave; but the Turks carried off his head and exposed it on the gates of the Seraglio at Constantinople, with the superscription, "Head of the famous Servian bandit, Kara George."[4]

Thus far the English writer quoted, who is a warm partisan of the Obrenovich dynasty, a friend of the late King Alexander and Queen Draga, whose atrocious murder he rightly reprobates. But there is another version of the death of Kara George. A writer in the *Contemporary Review* (July, 1903) gave publicity to an autobiographical testament written by Milosh, taken from the Servian archives by Milan and left to his illegitimate son, who now resides with his mother at Constantinople, and is said to aspire to the reversion of the throne. In this document he says: "We served faithfully Karageorgevich (Kara George) until he grew puffed up and became a tyrant. He sought to become the ally of a great Emperor[5] and to entangle us in his quarrels. Our family saw through him and judged him righteously according to the course he had taken, and we revolted against Karageorgevich and turned him away. We should have killed him had we caught him, for he

[4] "The Servian Tragedy," Hist. Intro., pp. 10-12.
[5] Emperor of Austria.

treacherously slew our brother. He came back twelve years later. On learning that he was in the country, I sent word to the chief of Palanka to send me his head. Voutch cut it off, and I received it from him, and Servia has had rest and quarreled with nobody ever since."

Servia does not seem to have enjoyed much rest under any of its rulers, and it is restless still. These little mushroom monarchies in the Balkan Peninsula have not yet struck any very deep roots: they are excrescences or outgrowths of a mixed civilization, half European, half Oriental. Their founders were only half-civilized nomads, peasants wholly lacking in culture of mind or morals. The blighting influence of Ottomanism is over them all. Though nominally Catholic, schism has narrowed their conception of a Church, and they have wholly failed to grasp the idea of universality, of a world-embracing Church, gathering every nation within its capacious fold. Their horizon is closed by their mountains; they have no breadth of mind or of purview. Cut off from unity, they are deprived of the chastening, elevating and refining influence of Catholicism as represented by Rome and the Churches in communion with the Holy See. Had it been otherwise, it would have fared better with the people as a nation. As it is, they have suffered from a succession of rulers who, ostensibly Christian, were cast in a Mohammedan mould. Milosh, for instance, had no higher conception of sovereignty than that suggested by the petty despotism of a Turkish Pasha. His morals and his methods were alike Turkish. He put down a rebellion with a rough and ruthless hand; foreign participators had their hands and tongues cut off in Kragujevat's market place before his eyes and natives were broken on the wheel. When he wanted to improve his capital, he ordered a whole suburb of Belgrade to be set on fire. Although a great national assembly, convened on November 6, 1817, conferred on him the title of Prince of the Servians, he governed without a Parliament and levied what taxes he pleased. Expropriation, we know, has been the order of the day in France and Italy, but thinly veiled under form of law. Milosh dispensed with legal formalities and appropriated whatever property chanced to take his fancy, whether lands, houses, jewels or lovely maidens, like any Oriental despot. Formally recognized by the Porte in 1830 on condition that he administered the affairs of Servia by and with the consent of an assembly of Servian notables, he still continued his absolutism, raised and abased officials arbitrarily and punished with the bastinado all who displeased him. A formidable insurrection broke out in 1835. A Constitution was wrung from him conferring democratic institutions, but he disregarded it. Russian

diplomacy, however, prevailed, and, by what has been called "a masterpiece of Russo-Turkish liberalism," a Council was established, practically setting aside Milosh's rule and governing in his stead.

The tables were turned. He was now virtually a prisoner in his own palace. On receiving from the Russian Consul assurances that he would thereby secure the succession for his son, he abdicated on June 13, 1839. His eldest son, Milan, then incurably ill, died on July 8 of the same year, ignorant of the fictitious and fleeting dignity that had been conferred upon him, and was succeeded by his next brother, Michael, a lad of sixteen, upon whom the Porte imposed a Regency, against which he chafed and protested. Several thousands of peasants rose in arms, marched on Belgrade and took Michael away from the Regents, who fled to Constantinople, leaving him free to govern according to democratic ideas. As he would not join in a Bulgarian insurrection, his own mother, Lynbitsa, conspired to bring about the return of her husband. Failing to suppress the conspiracy and deserted by his troops, he retired to Austria.

In 1842, the younger son of Kara George, Alexander Karageorgevich, a man of thirty-six, who had been living in Servia on a pension granted him by Milosh, was elected Prince. Another conspiracy drove him to seek refuge in the Turkish fortress at Belgrade, and on December 23, 1858, he was deposed by the Skupshtina, which recalled Milosh at the age of seventy-eight, after nearly twenty years' exile. Upon his death on September 26, 1860, he was succeeded by his son Michael, who established a standing army and expelled the Turkish garrisons from the fortresses they still occupied. Meanwhile Alexander Karageorgevich had not acquiesced in his deposition. A plot for his restoration culminated on June 10, 1868, in the assassination of Michael. Besides the actual murderers, several conspirators were shot, and Alexander Karageorgevich was sentenced by the Servian courts to twenty years' penal servitude for complicity in the plot. But the Hungarian Government refused to give him up, and he was ultimately released after eight years' imprisonment.

The next ruler the Servians gave themselves was a young scapegrace of fourteen, Milan, grandson of old Milosh's brother Ephrem. The son of Marie Catarji, a Frenchwoman of Roumanian origin, early separated from her husband and who had led a very free and easy life among the rakes of the Second Empire; educated by a Paris professor who was an atheist and a cynic; and a precocious profligate among the profligate idlers of that gay and guilty city, he was utterly *blasé* at the age of fourteen. His career as a juvenile sovereign was in keeping with the vicious upbringing of a youth

who had known none of the restraints of religion. Until he came of age he was a mere puppet in the hands of Regents who pandered to his passions, and whose control he eventually shook off only to fall under the evil spell of a loose woman, who embittered the life of his Queen, Nathalie (daughter of Colonel Keshko, a Russian, a wealthy landowner in Bessarabia), whom she persuaded him to divorce. After his military failures, domestic scandals, exactions and tyrannical rule had alienated the people, he abdicated, it is believed under the hypnotic influence of his paramour. He was succeeded by his young son, Alexander Obrenovich, born on August 14, 1876, and crowned on July 2, 1889, in the monastery of Zhicha, near Kraljevo, the oldest monastery in the country, built in 1210. His life and his fate were alike sad. "I am an orphan whose parents are still alive," observed the boy-King to one of his tutors on the day he received the allegiance of his subjects. As a Frenchman said, *"Il n'eut pas d'enfance."* Milijevich, a cousin of Karageorgevich, gives this glimpse of his indoor life during the Regency:

"The Regents allowed no scope to his affectionate sentiments; no friend of his own age, no tutor who had the qualities requisite to direct his heart or mind. They wanted to bring him up for themselves. A man slept on the mat outside his apartments. He lay down at eight in the evening and rose at five—the same hour as the King. He had orders to let nobody in after ten and to take the name of every one who entered before that hour. The King, feeling himself spied upon, grew shy and secretive, and took pleasure in circumventing the Regents."

They expelled his mother, but by a clever *coup d'état* on April 1, 1893 (O. S.), when he proclaimed himself of age and took the reins of government into his own hands at sixteen, he dismissed them and deprived them of the power they had misused. He was, however, himself compelled for state reasons to banish his own father, who had been spending in dissipation the handsome civil list pension he had extorted as the price of his abdication and intriguing to regain power. On the 5th of August, 1900, he took the fatal step which led to his downfall and death, when he was joined in wedlock in the Cathedral of Belgrade to Madame Draga Mashin, the handsome widow of a Bohemian engineer, whose father had been Prince Michael's physician and who himself had been agent for a swindling French bank, which collapsed after defrauding the Comte de Chambord of £20,000 and Leo XIII. of £100,000. Born on September 24, 1867, at Milanovats, a little fishing village on the Danube, she could, nevertheless, boast of ancestors who had been prominent among the vojvodes, or national leaders who gathered round Milosh in the war of independence. The daughter

of Pante Lunjevitsa, who had been Prefect of Shabats and had fallen into poverty, her income only amounted to £2 12s. a month when she captured the heart of King Alexander, who raised her to a throne and made her Queen Draga. It were far better for her had she remained in the obscurity of poverty than to be thrust into the glare and glitter of "the fierce light that beats upon a throne," the target for the poisoned darts of malevolent criticism, and for him, and for the country of which he was the ruler, had he formed an alliance with one of the reigning houses of Europe. Some such alliance was on the *tapis,* for one night at a state ball in Berlin the German Empress took aside the Servian Minister and congratulated him on what was thought to be the approaching marriage of King Alexander with a certain German princess. "You could not have a better Queen," said Her Majesty; "she has a heart of gold, she is as charming as she is beautiful, and she has told me that for the last two or three years she has been learning the Servian language and interesting herself in the Servian people, over whom she is destined to rule."

But a cruel destiny had decreed otherwise. Early on the morning of June 11, 1903, a treasonable plot, which for two years had been slowly elaborated, ended in the assassination of the King and Queen and the principal Ministers, one of the prime movers being Colonel Mashin, Queen Draga's brother-in-law by her first marriage, and the hired assassins,[6] a gang of officers of the Sixth Regiment, who did their bloody work with shocking brutality. The people were terrorized into acquiesence in what the plotters proclaimed "a glorious revolution," which has seated on the throne the present ruler, King Peter, grandson of Kara George and son of Alexander Karageorgevich, who reigned from 1842 to 1858.

History repeated itself in the environment in which the present sovereign of Servia grew up. The grandson of the peasant-founder of the reigning house was educated in a common school, sat on a wooden bench among peasant boys, played with them in the streets of Belgrade, where he was born in 1846, and was known by the name of "Pera" to his school companions. When his father was exiled to Hungary, the family lived like rustics, but the boy was sent to a boarding school in Geneva, from which, in 1863, he was withdrawn and sent to France, first to the Lycée of Sainte Barbe and then to the Military Academy of Saint Cyr. During the Franco-German War he served in the Foreign Legion and in 1875 was one of the chief organizers of the revolt of Bosnia against

[6] The total sum, it is said, paid out in rewards for the crime amounted to £12,000. The sixty-eight regicides were allowed to retain their commissions despite a protest from a large majority of Servian officers.

Turkey, commanding, under the name of Captain Merkunich, a small company of volunteers. From his boyhood he cherished hopes of ascending the throne of his not very remote ancestors and is assumed to have conspired, or at least manœuvred, to that end. He married Zorka, daughter of the Prince of Montenegro, and his sons were educated in the Military Academy at St. Petersburg. His cousin, Alexis, as representative of the elder branch of the family, had a prior right to the succession, but he had no partisans in Servia to support his claim. His successful competitor is described as a tall, spare, miiltary-looking man, with a sinister, hawklike face, marked by deep lines, grayish hair and moustache and shifty eyes.[7]

The capital, primitively Beograd, or the White City, now Belgrade, or the Beautiful City, is a smaller Budapest, as Budapest is a smaller Paris. On the terraced heights overlooking the town many a Servian patriot was impaled by the Turks and left to linger in agony. The ubiquitous Jew is very much in evidence, and the almost equally ubiquitous Scot has handed his name down to Servian posterity in a street—in fact, in a whole quarter, which bears a phonetic version of Mackenzie, the patronymic of an interesting speculator from north of the Tweed who made his pile in the Balkans. Belgrade is almost an entirely new city, like Sofia, where the old wooden houses fed the Russian camp fires. The citadel, the mosque, a few fountains with Turkish inscriptions and a ruined arch, called the Gate of Constantinople, are the only visible reminders of the extinct Moslem domination.

R. F. O'Connor.

Cork, Ireland.

ENGLAND BEFORE EMANCIPATION.[1]

NO READER of Monsignor Ward's two handsome volumes will be likely to lay them down without expressing the opinion that the author has produced a work of permanent historic interest and value. The period with which Mgr. Ward had to deal was one of infinite complexity, and such were the conditions prevailing within the ranks of the Catholic community, both clerical and lay, there must have been many temptations to the

[7] Vivian, p. 140.

[1] "The Eve of Catholic Emancipation, Being the History of the English Catholics During the First Thirty Years of the Nineteenth Century." By the Right Rev. Mgr. Ward, F. R., Hist. S., president of St. Edmund's College. London, Longmans, Green & Co., Paternoster Row. Vols. I. and II.

author to draw a veil over some of the episodes of the time. Mgr. Ward, however, possesses the instincts of the true historian, and acting on the counsels of Leo XIII. to all students of history—having found the truth—he tells exactly what occurred, disregarding the scruples which might have trammeled the pen of a weaker man. In this fact lies the great value of his work. Moreover, the learned president of St. Edmund's College brought to the discharge of the task he undertook a perfectly impartial mind, one totally divested, for the time being, at any rate, of anything in the nature of national bias or prejudice, and this other fact enables him to describe and judge the relations between the Catholics of Ireland and England in perfectly just proportions and with accurate discrimination between their respective positions throughout the long battle for Emancipation. How terribly strained the relations in question often were Mgr. Ward enables his readers to discern, but he generally leaves judgment as to who was or was not to blame to their impartiality. The truth, as might have been expected, is that neither side could claim to have been always in the right; but for this it would be unjust to hastily conclude that the side which—for the time being—was in the wrong was necessarily culpably so. The situation which existed at the time described by Mgr. Ward was enormously complicated, and if the position of Great Britain is fairly taken into account, it will seem almost marvelous that her public men and statesmen were found willing to devote as much attention as many of them undoubtedly did to the Catholic question. In this respect it may be accepted as certain that Ireland was the compelling strategic influence. The Catholics of Great Britain were an insignificant minority in the midst of an overwhelmingly Protestant population. The Catholics of Ireland, on the other hand, were to all intents and purposes a nation in themselves, and, what was more, a nation whose friendship, while she was surrounded by many enemies, was of eminent importance to Great Britain. It was, however, perfectly natural that the leading Catholics in the latter country should occasionally fail to quite recognize this truth. They were, most of them, persons of considerable social importance, to whom the idea of subordinating their personal ideas on points of political propriety to the more militant policy of their Irish brethren was often peculiarly galling. It was remembrance of this circumstance which once induced O'Connell—in a moment of aggravation—to declare that he had "emancipated them in spite of themselves."

In the preface to his first two volumes Mgr. Ward quite rightly says: "Politically speaking, Emancipation was from the beginning an Irish, not an English question; yet for a considerable time after the Act of Union the English Catholics had quite as much to say

in negotiating the matter as their brethren across the water. This was partly due to their being on the spot and partly to their possessing in their own body men of position and influence. Their demand was naturally different in character from that of the Irish, which was the agitation of the greater part of the nation. Hence arose a difference of opinion as to the conditions to be offered or accepted, of which the well-known Veto question forms an important, though by no means a solitary, instance. Owing partly to a difference of temperament, and partly to the difference of circumstances and history, it is never too easy for the Irish and English Catholics to act politically together; the difficulty was emphasized during the years which succeeded the passing of the Union. Gradually there arose a double movement, one of the nature of a petition for Emancipation, accompanied with a willingness to accept what became known as 'securities,' which the lay leaders in England—and also the aristocratic party in Ireland—represented; the other the demand for 'Unconditional Emancipation' on the part of the Irish, which grew in force as years went on. In the event the English Catholics failed to obtain Emancipation. They did indeed pass it through the House of Commons; but all their personal influence did not succeed in inducing the Peers to vote for it. Where their influence failed, the agitation of the Irish eventually succeeded. The bills of 1813 and 1821—the latter of which passed the House of Commons—were drafted by Charles Butler; the bill of 1825 was drafted by O'Connell; and although that, too, was thrown out by the Lords, by this time the Irish Catholic Association had established its power, and four years later Emancipation was forced from an unwilling Government: for when Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington declared in favor of it, they did so avowedly as the lesser of two evils, and because the state of Ireland had become such that it had become in their opinion ungovernable by any other policy." This is a perfectly correct description of a situation which was unfortunately too prolonged. One of the most prominent figures in Mgr. Ward's narrative is, as was indeed inevitable, the famous Bishop Milner. Commencing his career as a warm advocate of admission of the right of Veto on the part of the Crown or Government over the appointment of a particular nominee to a Catholic bishopric, Milner became a furious opponent of its acceptance and denounced in the most vehement terms, as potential heretics and schismatics, all whom he suspected of willingness to purchase Emancipation by offering any such "security." The simple truth about the Veto principle, of course, is that, both then and now, if any fair and friendly government had valid objection—on the ground of dis-

loyalty or otherwise—to offer to the appointment of any nominee for episcopal place the Holy See would be almost certain to give its representations the most careful consideration. Realization of this obvious truth appears to have always been absent from Milner's mind as well as from that of O'Connell, but it may no doubt be fairly argued that recognition of its certainty is a different thing from admission of a statutory or treaty right on the part of a secular authority to interfere in or influence ecclesiastical appointments. In the case of Ireland, the exercise of any such controlling or even supervisory power by the rulers of Protestant England would undoubtedly have proved seriously injurious to the authority of the episcopacy and probably have worked serious harm. On this latter point there is indeed little room for question, and Irish Catholics have ample ground for satisfaction in the circumstance that, when Emancipation was eventually secured, it was obtained free from any such deplorable condition. At the same time it is impossible not to read some of Milner's denunciations of his episcopal colleagues with regret that he should have used language of the unmeasured kind he constantly did.

On this point Mgr. Ward says: "Even apart from his literary work, for which Bishop Milner is justly famous, viewing him simply as a man of action, no one will now question that he was the greater and stronger man of the two"—he and Bishop Poynter, Vicar Apostolic of the London District—"and he left a more lasting impress of his work on English Catholicism of his day. Nevertheless, he had grave faults, which have not always been remembered by those who have estimated the value of his work. It must be remembered that hitherto practically the only source of information as to the merits of his disputes has been his own writings: Husenbeth, in his biography of Milner, naturally accepts his version without question, and Father Amherst, in his *History of Catholic Emancipation,* does so no less completely. Now Milner was essentially a special pleader, and his writings give only a one-sided view of the case. If such a man as the saintly Abbé Carron, of Somers Town, could give it as his deliberate opinion that the raising of Milner to the episcopate was a calamity to the Catholic Church in England, and if Bishop Bramston, the meekest of men, could speak of him as a greater enemy to religion than Luther himself, it is evident that there was at least another side to the question. That side has never been satisfactorily put forward in print. Charles Butler has indeed written in defense of Dr. Poynter, but only a very few pages; and in any case he is hardly the apologist whom the Bishop would have chosen; while Dr. Poynter himself, with a self-restraint which bordered on heroism, uniformly refrained from

writing in answer to the repeated attacks on him which Milner was continually making in pamphlets and other publications, in the *Orthodox Journal*, and even in his episcopal pastorals. He, however, kept many documents together, and left them behind him for the use of future generations, so that (as he said) Milner's accounts should not go down unchallenged to posterity as English Church history." No one who views the portrait and photograph of a bust of Dr. Poynter and notes the high-bred and gentle, sweetly ascetic features of that holy prelate can fail to realize how much he must have suffered under the constant and sledgehammer attacks of his more coarse-fibred, but equally devoted assailant. That Milner was not as much actuated by conscientious motives, whether acting as a Vetoist or as an anti-Vetoist, need not be questioned. What is most to be regretted is that he allowed both his pen and his tongue to run away with him as they so often did. All the same, he left Catholic Ireland his debtor, and thereby left the Church his debtor.

Milner was consecrated Bishop and Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District at Winchester in 1803, while Dr. Poynter was consecrated and became Vicar of the London District only a week later. It was probably one of the ironies of fate that Milner should have been the preacher on the latter occasion, and that a considerable portion of his discourse was devoted to a eulogy of the existing circumstances of the Church in England—so far as its internal affairs were concerned, while he told the congregation that "many things regarding religion were settled with perfect unanimity." It may be as well at this point to set out what exactly were the grievances under which the Catholics of England labored at this moment. The majority of these had their origin in secular disabilities, for they had enjoyed practically complete freedom of conscience since the passage of the Relief Act of 1791. At the same time they had some serious injustices of a religious nature still to complain of, and Mgr. Ward quotes a list of these, drawn up in 1804 by Bishop Douglas, at the request of Mr. Brockholes, a member of an eminent Lancashire family, who desired to submit them to the Government in the hope of securing their abolition. The list was as follows:

"1. That of Catholic marriages or of marriages of Catholics celebrated by Catholic priests being deemed invalid by the existing laws, so that if one of the parties quit the other *quacunque de causa,* the deserted party receives no relief from the parish nor redress from the law of his or her country. The priest also, it is said, may be transported or put in prison and condemned to transportation for having married the parties.

"2. That of foundations or of moneys appropriated for the main-

tenance of priests or to the support of Catholic worship, are deemed by the existing laws to be appropriated *to superstitious purposes,* and as such are liable to confiscation: and when alienated or seized upon by malevolent persons, cannot be recovered by law. Instances of such alienations and seizures might be adduced.

"3. That of Catholics serving in His Majesty's army and navy being withheld from attending divine service according to the rite of their own religion on Sundays and festivals and of their being compelled to go to Protestant churches on those days *against their will*—an evil that leads brave and loyal subjects to complain and to be discontented, etc., etc., at a time when every hand and heart should be united to oppose the enemy; and the United Kingdom should be as one man."

The civil disabilities of which the Catholics complained practically deprived them of most of the rights of citizenship, and these are quoted by Mgr. Ward from a list prepared by Charles Butler in the following terms:

"1. By the 13th Charles II., commonly called the Corporation Act, their whole body is excluded from offices in cities and corporations.

"2. By the 25th Charles II., commonly called the Test Act, their whole body is excluded from civil and military offices. . . .

"3. By the 7th and 8th William III., c. 27th, Roman Catholics are liable to be prevented from voting at elections.

"4. By the 30th Charles II. s. 2, c. 1, Roman Catholic Peers are prevented from filling their hereditary seats in Parliament.

"5. By the same statute Roman Catholics are prevented from sitting in the House of Commons.

"6th. By several statutes Roman Catholics are disabled from presenting to advowsons, a legal incident of property which the law allows even to the Jew."

It is worthy of note that the right of presenting to advowsons —that is, appointing Protestant ministers to benefices owned by Catholics—is still denied to members of the old faith; but it can scarcely be alleged that this is a matter of serious moment. In the case of converts, however, who have relatives ministers of the Church of England, the disability is sometimes resented. Whether or not a Catholic—even if free to do so—could conscientiously appoint a clergyman of a heterodox creed is probably a question upon which theologians would have a great deal to say. All the other disabilities enumerated by Butler have ceased to exist.

Both Milner and Butler recognized, much as they constantly differed upon other points, that on the passage of the Act of Union and on the consequent recognition of Ireland as an integral portion

of the United Kingdom the balance of Catholic political power passed to the Catholics of that country. In 1807 the Bishop wrote: "The fate of us English Catholics depends on that of our brethren in Ireland. If their claims are overlooked, ours will never be thought worthy of notice. On the other hand, whatever redress of grievances or legal privileges they obtain, we shall not long remain deprived of. Our political weight and importance compared with theirs is small indeed. In a word, they are the stately vessel which catches the breeze and stems the tide; we are the cockboat which is towed in her wake." With absolute correctness, Mgr. Ward says that the Catholic religion had indeed never been kept under in Ireland quite as it had been in England. Mass was not entirely proscribed there in the eighteenth century; for with the greater part of the nation Catholic, it would have been practically impossible to carry out such a measure.[2] There were indeed many persecuting restrictions; but notwithstanding these, priests continued to be appointed in every parish, and the clergy retained their influence over the people. A still more important difference concerned the episcopate. Although the law tolerated parish priests, by a strange contradiction it refused to tolerate Bishops. They were condemned to banishment, and if they returned, to death. Nevertheless, the Irish kept up the succession of their episcopate without intermission, though the Bishops often had to go by false names and to conceal themselves when searched for. It was to this double preservation of Bishops and parish priests that Cardinal Manning always attributed the preservation of the faith among the people.[3] Their pastors were their natural leaders, and never lost that position. The troubles between the laymen and the Bishops in England during the last part of the eighteenth century had no counterpart in the sister isle. The Bishops and clergy together led a body forming the greater part of the nation, and their strength was certain in the end to assert itself. Nevertheless, the laws regulating worship under the well-known Acts of Queen Anne[4] were very severe, and during the first half of the eighteenth century many of them were enforced. All the regular clergy were subject to banishment, and although a secular priest was allowed in each parish, he was forbidden to have a curate. He was required to register his name and place of abode, and was not allowed to officiate elsewhere. Over 1,000

---

[2] In general, the hopeless task of preventing some three-fourths of the nation from celebrating the rites which they believed essential to their salvation was not attempted.—Lecky, "Ireland in the Eighteenth Century," I., p. 156.

[3] Pastoral Office, p. 222.

[4] "An act to prevent the further growth of Popery" (1704), and "a further act" (1709), termed by Edmund Burke the "ferocious acts of Queen Anne."

parish priests immediately registered themselves; but as time went on it became doubtful whether new priests would be allowed to register, especially as by the later Act a new oath was prescribed, declaring that the "Pretender" had no right or title to the Crown of England, which the clergy as a whole considered that they could not conscientiously take.[5] For this reason they ceased to apply for registration and in practice numerous unregistered priests, both secular and regular, exercised their ministry in evasion of the law. The old parish churches were all in the hands of the Protestants; but Catholics were allowed to have a "chapel" in each parish. This was often little more than a barn or hovel, but it served to enable the people to hear Mass under shelter. There was a curious provision that it should not have a steeple or bell, nor be surmounted by a cross.[6] Presumably the object of this restriction—which had a counterpart so lately as in the English Act of 1791 and the Irish Act of 1793—was to be a continual reminder that a Catholic place of worship was not a "church" in the legal acceptation of the term, and the distinction between "church" and "chapel" acquired a meaning which has survived to our own day. The difficulty about the prohibition of a bell to call the people to service in days when clocks and watches were not plentiful was often surmounted by hanging a bell on a neighboring tree. In the outlying districts Mass was often said in out-of-the-way sheds, or even in the open air under a tree;[7] and there were various secret signs to inform the people when and where it was to be celebrated. But although the celebration of Mass was in a certain measure tolerated, it was still obligatory by law to attend the (Protestant) parish church on Sunday, under an old unrepealed Elizabethan statute, the penalty for non-compliance being one shilling each time.[8] And in order to decoy the clergy, it was enacted by a further statute of Queen Anne in 1709 that every priest who turned Protestant became entitled to an annuity of £30 a year for life.[9]

The mere fact that one thousand parish priests so promptly took advantage of the Act permitting registration shows that they were already officiating among the people. Indeed, it is doubtful if the lot of an informer, and especially of an informer against a priest, was ever a happy one in Ireland, and it may be doubted if many

---

[5] Lecky, I., p. 159. Under the previous act they were bound to take an oath of allegiance to the reigning power. This they freely took, but to disclaim any right or title for the "Pretender" was a further step, to which they felt they could not in conscience proceed.

[6] Lecky, I., p. 156; Parnell, "History of the Penal Laws," p. 41.

[7] Lecky, I., p. 267.

[8] Parnell, p. 20.

[9] *Ibid*, p. 40.

of the type ever indulged in the profitable occupation a second time. We have, for instance, heard of a case which occurred in the County Kerry in the seventeenth century, in which a wretched miller, for some base reason of his own, proposed to give information that the young heir of a considerable property was a Catholic. This miserable man, like most of his class at the time, could neither read nor write, and on his design in some way becoming known, a deputation of the tenantry of the aforesaid heir waited on him at night and removed his tongue. The outrage, of course, was a terrible one, but the estates were saved and remained in the possession of the descendants of the heir until they were recently sold, under Mr. Wyndham's Land Purchase Act, to the then tenants, some of whom are descendants of members of the deputation which called at the mill two hundred years ago. It is incidents of this kind which explain the confusion of thought sometimes found to exist among the Irish peasantry as regards the sanctity of "law and order." The act committed was, of course, as repugnant to the law of the Church as to the statute law, but it can scarcely be denied that it had some excuse and was certainly ingenious. The miller laid no information. Long oppressed though they had been, and deprived so far as possible of all opportunities for education at home, the Catholics of Ireland, as soon as the Penal laws were relaxed, rapidly grew in wealth and social importance. In 1807 Milner visited the country, and he has left on record an account of the conditions he found existing, which is quoted by Mgr. Ward. He wrote: "Industrious, intelligent, honest and frugal, they have acquired by commerce or trade not only the conveniences of life, but also the means of purchasing considerable portions of the inheritance of their forefathers, which the luxury of the present nobility and gentry has obliged the latter to sell. It is said that more than two-thirds of the real property which has been sold of late years in Ireland has been bought by Catholics; and a well-informed writer asserts that within the last twelvemonth alone they have purchased lands to the amount of above £800,000. From what I myself can observe, it is clear to me that upon the whole there is now a vast deal more wealth amongst the Irish than amongst the English Catholics, notwithstanding so many of the latter are persons of noble families and of great landed property." Mgr. Ward himself says that: "At the time when Milner wrote Catholic 'chapels' were rising everywhere of large size and elaborate design. The movement had been helped on by the action of the Orangemen in the North during the rebellion in 1798; for they had burned or destroyed numerous chapels, for which the Government made compensation; and by the further aid of volun-

tary contributions they were rebuilt on an improved scale. In other parts of Ireland the Catholics were stimulated by this example, and Milner enumerates ten prominent churches which he himself had seen, either in use or in course of construction. He awards the palm to the new Cathedral at Waterford for its exterior and that at Cork for its interior. He also mentions the church at Thurles, then in course of construction. The Pro-Cathedral in Marlborough street, Dublin, was begun in 1815.[10] This movement has gone forward ever since, the two noble cathedrals at Queenstown and Armagh being the most notable examples in recent years. Moreover, the movement has not been confined to cathedrals and parish churches, but has extended to convents and charitable institutions of all kinds. Together with increase of wealth amongst Catholics came also a sense of their own power. We can again quote Milner.[11] He calls it 'one of the political phenomena of the present times; a people without any revolution or other visible cause rising as it were all at once from apparent insignificancy and absolute contempt to the first rank of importance and respectability in the scale of nations.'" At the same time that developments such as these were taking place the Protestant Ascendancy party were carrying on an elaborate and highly organized system of proselytism, liberally subsidized by the Westminster Parliament, for the uprooting of the Catholic faith amongst the poorer section of the people. It is only just to state, however, that the subsidy in question was only paid in continuation of grants long quoted by Grattan's Irish Parliament, which was, of course, exclusively Protestant in composition. Of this base system Milner wrote, and there was no exaggeration in his words: "I have already had abundant means of learning that the Protestants of Ireland in almost every part of it are possessed of the most ardent zeal for proselytizing the Catholics; and this not by any means of cool conviction and edifying example, but by downright bribes and terror. Here a Protestant lady clothes, feeds and provides for Catholic children exclusively, whose parents will sell them to her at this price, for the sake of bringing them up Protestants; there a Protestant landlord turns all his Catholic tenants out of their farms or exacts an oath as a condition of holding them, that they will send their children to a Protestant school, which he has set up for the express purpose of proselytism. But why should I dwell on the private instances of the system of Protestant proselytizing when it has been publicly professed and acted upon by the Government of the country ever since it gave

[10] It took a long time to build, and was not roofed in until 1823. The first public service in it was the funeral of Dr. Troy in that year.

[11] "Letters From Ireland," p. 4.

up that of putting its subjects to death for adhering to their religion? In fact, sir, unexampled as such proceedings are in past times, astonishing as they will appear in ages to come, no less than £25,000 continue annually to be levied in a great measure upon the Catholics themselves independently of the rents of immense landed estates, for purchasing the children of indigent Catholics (inasmuch as no Protestant child can be admitted into a charter school unless a sufficient number of Catholic children cannot be procured) and educating them in the Protestant religion. In still greater violation of the laws of nature, these purchased victims are uniformly transported in covered wagons or carts to the greatest distance possible from the residence of their parents—the children of the Northern provinces being conveyed to the charter schools of the South and those of the South to the schools in the North, in order that the parent may never have the consolation of embracing the child, lest he or she should again make a Papist of it; and the child may never enjoy the advantage of a parent's love and support, for fear it should thereby lose those religious impressions which at so great an expense have been wrought upon it! The Turks indeed take away the children of their Greek subjects in order to recruit the ranks of their janissaries; but they do this from a motive of policy, not of religion; the Irish Government alone of all Governments of the world violates the laws of God and nature in extinguishing parental and filial affection and in separating parents and children for life from a principle of proselytism."[12] The whole business was simply abominable and shameful, and the only marvel is that it proved absolutely futile against the almost stolid determination of even the most poverty-stricken among the people to have nothing to do with the creed of Luther, which they refused to accept instead of that of the Apostles. That, however, it should produce a certain amount of demoralization and of double-facedness amongst those who were subjected to its debasing influence was probably inevitable. In the estimation of its managers, however, even this was not a disadvantage.

If we now turn to the consideration of the state of the Catholic religion in England and of the regrettable differences of opinion which arose between Dr. Poynter and Dr. Milner, it is impossible not to see that the conflict between them was largely due to the wide difference between their personal characteristics. Describing these, Mgr. Ward says: "The consecration of Bishops Milner and Poynter introduced two important new elements into the counsels of the vicars apostolic, destined in their different ways to exert far-reaching influence. Dr. Poynter's work lay largely in the future;

[12] "Letters From Ireland," p. 22.

for he was at this time only a coadjutor, and had to keep his own views subservient to those of his chief, Bishop Douglas. Nevertheless, from the beginning his influence was felt. He was a well-read theologian, fresh from his books—for he continued to teach theology at St. Edmund's College—and had both the strength and the weakness of a man accustomed to scholastic disputation. He had a strong faculty for reasoning and for accurate thought so often produced by that study; but he was also not devoid of its frequent accompaniment in such surroundings, a mind that can perhaps be not unfairly described as argumentative. Being the junior Bishop at the Synod of Winchester and Old Hall, it devolved on him to prepare the matter for the discussions and to report the decisions adopted, which duties he discharged to the satisfaction of all. Throughout his episcopate his familiarity with all the departments of theology and canon law were of good service to his brethren. If ever it became necessary to prepare a case to be referred to Rome, he was able to state it accurately and concisely and in attractive Latin, for he was a master of that language. He was equally fluent in French, the knowledge of which he had acquired during his long residence at Douay, and he had also a fair knowledge of Italian.

In later years, when he had to correspond with Consalvi and other Roman Cardinals and dignitaries, his linguistic attainments gave him considerable power. He also had great advantages when dealing with Catholic affairs in England. He was a close friend of Bishop Gibson, of the Northern District, then Senior Vicar Apostolic, who had been his president for nine years at Douay; and he was also well known to the other Bishops, while many of the clergy in the South, and some also in the North, had been his pupils at Douay or Old Hall. His devotion to the old Catholic families was well known, and his work, first as vice president, subsequently as president of St. Edmund's College, kept him in touch with many of the most prominent of them, for in those days a large proportion of the Catholic aristocracy sent their sons to be educated at Old Hall. Dr. Poynter always won the respect of the parents, and the troubles due to mismanagement which occurred at the college during the first decade of the century, culminating in the rebellion among the students in 1809, they always attributed—and not without reason—to his frequent and long-continued absences, rendered inevitable by his double position. His courteous manner and unfailing tact always stood him in good stead, and when afterwards thrown into the midst of public affairs, he was able to deal with them far more easily than might have been expected from one who had lived so long within the walls of a college.

"But during the early years of his episcopate his chief work consisted in winning the respect and affection of the leading laymen and by the quiet, unobtrusive influence of his personality helping to break down the unfortunate barrier between the Bishops and the laity, which had been set up by the regrettable events which centred round the passing of the Relief Act of 1791.

"Milner, on the other hand, had a varied and difficult work before him. He was thrown into the very midst of his enemies. The Mirland District was notorious as the centre of that 'liberal' form of Catholicism which produced the group of priests known as the 'Staffordshire Clergy.' They could not but regard his advent as their Bishop with apprehension. It is creditable both to Milner himself and to the Midland clergy that the state of tension lasted only a short time. The death of the Rev. John Carter, which had taken place a few weeks before, removed the chief leader of disaffection—the only one, in fact, still residing in the Midland District who had not made a proper apology to his Bishop. Writing to Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, within a month of his consecration, Milner bears witness to the reception which had been accorded to him. 'Instead of experiencing that violent opposition which was generally expected by my friends,' he wrote, 'I find all the clergy and laity with whom I have hitherto had any concerns as respectful and submissive as I could wish them to be.'[13] The fact is that those who came into contact with him soon learned to appreciate his great qualities and conceived an admiration for him, the tradition of which has lasted down to our own day. Over and above the work in his own district, Milner was concerned with various questions bearing on the welfare of the Church in England in which he took a prominent part. . . . It might have been hoped that the more responsible position in which he was now placed would have caused him to moderate the habitual harshness of his language and the severity of his judgments. It does not appear, however, that such was the case, and as a consequence, throughout Milner's long episcopate, the Midland District[14] was as isolated from the other three as it was in the times of his two predecessors, Bishops Thomas Talbot and Charles Berington, though for a precisely opposite reason. Formerly the Bishops and clergy had been accused of lax principles bordering on unorthodoxy; henceforth the isolation was due to intolerance on the side of strictness."[15] It is regrettable to be obliged to state, but it is nevertheless undeniable that Milner had, by dint of his powerful personality and efforts, literally thrust

[13] Letter in Dublin archiepiscopal archives.

[14] It must be remembered that England at the time in question was divided into "districts," and not, as now, into dioceses.

[15] "The Eve of Catholic Emancipation," Vol. I., pp. 20, 21.

himself into the ranks of the English episcopacy. There is no reason for assuming that in doing so he was animated by any unworthy motives. He was perfectly convinced that he alone was capable of averting dangers which he believed threatened religion in England. That he was partly right in this belief seems possible. At any rate, he had his belief, and was no way reticent in expressing it or shy about acting on it. Indeed, Mgr. Ward quotes a letter of his, dated from Winchester, October 26, 1802, to the British Government agent in Rome, Sir John Coxe Hippisley, the contents of which, if known by the Pope, would probably have prevented his ever being elevated to the episcopal office. In this document he actually threatened to abandon the sacred ministry unless he was made a Bishop!

William F. Dennehy.

Dublin, Ireland.

THE MANRIQUES, BATTLE-LORDS AND POETS.

THE story of the Manriques is a golden page from the book of heroic Spain; it is the compendium of all that chivalry and knighthood, that full flowering of the most manly civilization of Europe, when the grand qualities of the pagan seemed to join all that was most noble and beautiful in the Christian heart. From the half-legendary lords of Lara and the times of primitive chronicles, the Manriques descend from the eldest son of Pedro Gonzales Manrique de Lara, who married Ermessinda, Vicountess of Narbonne, and fell in battle in 1164. They ally themselves adown the centuries with the most powerful and distinguished; their name and prowess are everywhere in the annals of those hardy ages before the great nobles succumbed to the absolute rule of Hapsburg and Bourbon; they are doughty warriors and statesmen of the mailed hand in the turbulent days of the Enriques and Juans; they are Primates and Archbishops of Compostela and Sevilla; scholars and poets, collectors of books, patrons of learning and art; grand masters of knightly orders, courtiers and troubadours under royal balconies; allied with royalties of Castile and Aragon, lords of Molina and Amusco, counts of Morata de Paredes, marquises of Aguilar, Sotomayors, Portocarreros and Mendozas, with priests, and saints and cloistresses of their blood to guard their mortuary shrines.

With the death of Enrique *el doliente,* "The Sickly," husband of Catherine of Lancaster and champion of the anti-Pope Benedict XIII., the troubled throne of Castile passed in 1406 into the beau-

tiful, but helpless, hands of Juan II. With the departure from the scene of the foolish queen-mother there appeared the young favorite, Alvaro de Luna, the King's playmate from childhood, a character too great and fine for the age in which he lived. The King was content to lie upon silken cushions hearing the wandering poets and musicians, polishing his own writings according to the laws of *cortesia* and *mesura,* ordaining jousts of knights and courts of love and culture. Two hundred poets came and went, and swarms of minstrels and artists in gold and weaving, while the Castile fell deeper and deeper into confusion, and the great nobles warred among themselves like independent princes. For thirty years the young Don Alvaro struggled to maintain and extend the royal power, the one cool head among the feasters of the court, the most serious, the most powerful, the most hated in the land. Among the sturdiest of his enemies appears Don Pedro Manrique, eighth Lord of Amusco, at the head of a formidable faction, resolved to strip this young upstart from Aragon of his state and control; but Don Alvaro succeeded after a violent capture in casting him into prison, whence he emerged in 1449, only to die in the midst of a revulsion of feeling in his favor, when the court of the fickle Juan went into mourning, and Count Haro entered into the royal presence leading Don Pedro's two sons, Rodrigo and Gomez, and obtained the restoration of their family estates and dignities.

It is with these sons and with Jorge Manrique, the panegyrist of his father, Rodrigo, that we are principally concerned in a study of this typical great family of the fifteenth century. Gomez has won a glory of his own in letters as well as in the councils and factions of his time. Rodrigo, for all his power and great virtues, lives in vicarious fame through the great elegy written on his death.

Born in 1412, Rodrigo, Count of Paredes, early took his place in the ranks of the warriors of his family; he is a typical example of the hardy captains of a century when whole lives were spent in the saddle and council of war. He had accompanied his father in the campaigns against Don Alvaro, and, later, was an active leader in the factions that convulsed Castile and ended only in the triumph of the nobles over the royal favorite and his death upon the scaffold in 1453. Don Rodrigo also distinguished himself against the Moors and won special glory in capturing their city of Huescar, in Granada. He is also said to have fonud time to compose poetry; and in the words of his son:

> Then for the prudence of his ways,
> For merit, and in high award
> Of service knightly,
> His dignity they came to raise
> Till he was Master of the Sword
> Elected rightly.

As the powerful Grand Master of Santiago his state became practically royal, until his death in 1476 at Uclés, where he was entombed in the Capilla Mayor, according to Mariana ("Historia General de España," Vol. XII., page 322), although his son has written that he died at Ocaña.

The younger brother, Gomez, Lord of Villazopeque, was born in 1413, and educated under the influence of his uncle, Mendoza, the great Marquis of Santillana. He early took his place among the most elegant *trovadores* and court poets of Juan II. From these voluptuous surroundings he was called away by his sterner brother to take his part in warring on the Moors of Huescar, where he is said to have borne himself with gallantry. Henceforth his career is one of wounds and honors, riches and cares of state, and we find him holding a seat in the royal council and acting as *corregidor* and *alcalde* of the citadel of Toledo. His "Coplas de Mal gobierno de Toledo" ("Stanzas on the Bad Government of Toledo") have therefore particular point as a satire on the discords of the reign of the miserable Enrique "The Impotent," who had succeeded Juan II., and even eclipsed that monarch in futility. Gomez was not without humor, in spite of the strong moralistic leaning of some of his poems in the "Cancionero General" (nuevamente añadido, Toledo, 1520), and in his eighteen stanzas of *arte menor* we see much of the man and his times, even if he is not at his best as a poet:

When mighty Rome was conqueror,
'Twas Scipio led the van of fighting;
Old Fabius was her counsellor,
And Titus Livius did her writing;
And not a maid or wife but came
And stripped the ornaments upon her,
To offer them for warlike fame
And save her country from dishonor.

Where none there be to rule the town
How soon its triumphing is ended!
How soon the rooftree tumbles down
Where not a dweller is attended!
If pigs without the dogs to herd
Will straggle quick to their perdition,
Can troops without a captain's word
Be ever brought to war condition?
The sheep without a shepherd's rod
Will lay in waste both field and garden;
The monks that own no prior's nod
Will fall to sins beyond a pardon.
The vineyards left unwatched to grow
Unto each passer-by will yield them;
The courts where gallants never show
Are hands that have no gloves to shield them.
The shoe that fares without a sole
Can ill preserve the feet that wear it;
The strings escaped the lute's control
Will make a sound—if you can bear it.
The church that boasts no lettered throng,
A palace without walls, must tremble;
Who looks for fish both big and strong
Save where the firmest nets dissemble?

In faith that blow meseemeth light
Of which a swordless hand is giver;
But a sword without a hand of might—
Full little thrust will it deliver!

Sometimes Gomez writes in the old manner as above, and again he shows his sympathy with the Italian innovations that his uncle, Santillana, had introduced. It is not unappropriate, therefore, that he should have employed a symbolism almost Dantesque in 1458 for his elegy on the death of the learned marquis. On the other hand, he has left some lines in Portuguese replying to one Don Alvaro; and the style and conventions of the Galician troubadours are evident in such poems as "The Battle of Loves," "The Seven Deadly Sins" and "The Pursuit of Vices and Virtues." In his works we find traces of the various influences that resulted in the tremendous masterpiece of his nephew, "The Stanzas;" he writes an exquisite lament in the Italian manner over the death of the poet Garcilasco de La Vega, and lines to his wife, Juana de Mendoza, portraying in graphic and beautiful figures the fleeting of life and the sharp stroke of the hand of death.

Gomez Manrique took a prominent part in every line of artistic endeavor; he was considered one of the greatest orators in a day when courts were swayed by eloquent discourses in the manner of the Romans and battlefields beheld contests of lordly tongues as well as of weapons hand to hand. ("Hist. Crit. de la Lit. Española," Vol. VII., page 115.) He figures also in the early history of the stage, as his "Representacion del Nacimiento de Nuestro Señor" is the first successor of the "Misterio de los Reyes Magos." His work is a kind of drama in twenty octosyllabic stanzas; the different characters are the Virgin Mary, St. Joseph and the Angels Gabriel, Michael and Raphael, as well as the shepherds of Bethlehem. It closes with a cradle song, and, from the presence of an *estribillo,* or refrain, at the end of each stanza, the work must come under the head of primitive opera as well as of the drama. It was composed and performed in the convent of Calabazano, where his sister was ruling as abbess. There is also another play from his pen, written to celebrate the birthday of the hapless Don Alfonso, who was substituted for his brother, the helpless Enrique IV., but died shortly after of poison. In this play the Infanta Isabel the Catholic appeared as one of the muses.

The importance of Gomez Manrique in early lyrical as well as satirical poetry is recognized more and more by the Spanish critics, since, aside from the intrinsic merit and simple manly charm of his own poems, he represents a point of convergence of the three great fountain heads of Spanish literature, viz., the florid elegance of the old Latin stock of the Senecas, Martial and Quintilian; the

Arab sententiousness and didactic quality as it appeared in the rhyme of his famous kinsman, Lopez de Ayala, and the culture of the Italian renascence for which his uncle, Inigo Lopez de Mendoza, Marques de Santillana, was standing sponsor. Hitherto his importance has been largely measured according as he influenced the style of his nephew, Jorge, whose "Coplas" or "Stanzas" are still the greatest glory not only of the Manriques, but of the letters of the fifteenth century. Gomez survived both his martial brother, Rodrigo, the Grand Master of Santiago, and Jorge, and died in 1491, at the ripe age of eighty-two, after having commanded his tomb of alabaster beside his spouse, Doña Juana de Mendoza, in the Church of Santa Clara de Calabanzos.

Born in a home that is said to have been a complete school of the arts and sciences of the time, Jorge Manrique, Lord of Belmontejo, was the fourth son of Doña Mencía de Figueroa and Rodrigo, the Grand Master, whose death he was to sing in the unrivaled "Stanzas." The date of his birth is fixed about 1440, and he could hardly have more than "lisped numbers" when he also was plunged into the maelstrom of war and political intrigue. He followed the party of Don Alfonso, to whom the throne was offered in 1465, the unhappy prince rewarding him with the revenues of Villafruela, the escort of seven lances and the commandery of Montizon of the Order of Santiago. He joined his cousins, the Estûñgas, in warring on the priorate of San Juan, which was held by Juan de Valenzuela, the favorite of the dethroned Enrique, and succeeded in substituting Alvaro de Estúñiga as prior. After Enrique's death he was elected Trece of the Order of Santiago, a post of high honor and responsibility, when in 1475 he was called upon to defend the throne of Isabella the Catholic against the invasion of the rival claimant, the gallant Alfonso of Portugal. Jorge Manrique met the famous Marquis de Villena on the field of Calatrava, forcing him to retire and deliver over the Castle of Uclés in 1476. The Marquis persisting in his rebellion, Manrique and Pedro Ruiz de Alarcon were sent out to subdue him; on March 27, 1479, Manrique engaged him in battle before the gates of Garci-Munoz, and placed himself with such recklessness in the midst of his enemies that his followers lost sight of him. He received numerous wounds and died fighting, his sword in his hand. They carried the corpse to the town of Uclés and laid it in the old church of Santiago; in preparing him for the tomb they found hidden in his breast these *coplas* he had been composing "against the world:"

O World that givest and destroyest,
Would that the newer life alone
Were all of living!
For here, as good or ill deployest,
The parting is with gladness known

Or with misgiving.
Thy paths are so with griefs encumbered,
With sighing every breeze so steeped,
With wrongs so crowded—
A desert where no boon is numbered,
Its sweetness and seduction reaped,
And black and shrouded.
Thy highway is the road of weeping;
Thy long farewells are bitterness
Without a morrow,
Where down its ruts and ditches keeping
The traveler who doth most possess
Hath most of sorrow.
Thy chattels are but had with sighing;
With sweat of brow alone obtained
The wage they give;
In myriads thine ills come hieing,
And once existence they have gained
They longest live.

It is in such lines as these—typical of the warrior poet, although the late master critic, Menendez y Pelayo, omits them from his authorized text of "The Stanzas"—that we discover the true spirit of the fifteenth century, its nobility of purpose, the corruption in its high places and the pathos of its common life following upon the civil wars. Heaven seemed more than ever a place of refuge for the believing soul, a relief from a world unusually dark and troubled, with cities depopulated, roads gone to ditches and journeys unreturning and oblivious. Not that Jorge Manrique was always the stern moralist we find him in "The Stanzas;" as the favorite of his uncle, Gomez, he naturally took his place among the imitators of the Galician troubadours, and deeply enamored of his bride, Doña Guiomar de Menéses, he composed in her praise many *canciones* and *dezires*—songs and conceits—as well as other poems grave and gay, which show the poet of "The Stanzas" in the process of development. Thus his little lament, "Quien no estuviese en presencia," takes new interest:

Let him whose time hath come to go
Put never faith where he must part;
Forgetful and change of heart
Are penalties the absent know.
You would be loved—a lover you?—
Then pay your court incessant there,
For hardly have you vanished ere
Remembrance goes as lightly, too.

Then off with idle hope, and start
Let him whose time hath come to go;
Forgetfulness and change of heart
Are penalties the absent know.

If his works of humor seem light and thin, and the satire on his stepmother without the dignity that marks his references to his enemies in the course of "The Stanzas," Jorge Manrique is ever the man of rank and culture of his period. Since Alfonso X. the Wise had set the example, every courtier and warrior of Spain had become something of a poet or a chronicler, alternating from the Galician, Portuguese or Limousin to the Castilian newly

consecrated into literary preëminence by the bookish monarch's mandate. Such was the state of letters when in 1476 Jorge's father, the Grand Master Rodrigo, passed away at the summit of his earthly honors and powers. The sight of this catafalque laden down with all that fame, achievement and affection could afford struck the poet's heart with a vast sense of the futility of earthly hopes, and he broke forth into a chant of such solemn grandeur, such honest, manly pathos, that with one step he took his place at the head of the poets of his century and among the greatest singers of the world and time. He was but thirty-six years of age when he turned from literary trifling to write "The Stanzas," which Lope de Vega declares "should be inscribed in letters of pure gold"—the world's greatest poem of grief and consolation. Opening with wisdom and lamentation from out the ages, it rolls on with the lordly obsequies of the old religion, unfolding the ghostly pageantries of kings, the filial pride and weeping of lonely hearthstones, until the hand of faith is laid upon the bowed shoulders, and there comes the modulation of the pain, a gathering springtime of hope, the fulness of peace, and at last a far symphony of angelic harps. Again in vision five centuries later we see the banners wave from the castle rock of Ocaña; the voice of the serf and freeman comes over the fresh furrows on the hills of morn; though in the valley church of Uclés the dust gathers softly on the tomb of Don Rodrigo, the Grand Master, and Jorge Manrique, his poet.

It was still an age of poets and lamentations such as the old chronicler Sanchez de Tobar describes at the burial of the King Don Sancho in the thirteenth century, when "Don Nuño Gonzalez and all the gentry and people of Toledo made very great lamentation, and you or any other man could not think how great it was. And the Archbishop Don Gonzalo, with all the clergy, and with the priestly knights and all the nobles, took the body on the same day in the morning, and they carried it to the Church of Santa Maria in Toledo, and the Infante Don Enrique and Don Nuño, with the Queen, made very great lamentation. And the Archbishop straightway said Mass, and when it was finished they interred the body in a stone monument which he had ordered to be made during his lifetime." It was from some such obsequies that Jorge Manrique gathered the thoughts embodied in his "Stanzas" on his father's death:

> I turn me from the praise and singing
> Of panegyrists and the proud
> Old poets' stories;
> I would not have them hither bringing
> Their artful potions that but cloud
> His honest glories.

His faith and trust in God alone are real consolations for his

grief, but meditation on the worthlessness of earthly goods is put forward in mitigation of the human dread of death. The sense of the actual in his illustrations cannot have been unconscious, for we see again his impatience with empty formulas when he writes:

Recount no more of Troy or foeman
The echo of whose wars is now
But far tradition;
Recount no more how fared the Roman
(His scroll of glories we allow),
Nor his perdition;
Nor here rehearse the homely fable
Of such as yielded up their sway
These decades gone;
But let us say what lamentable
Fate the lords of yesterday
Have fallen upon.

Just as the old kings and their offspring had fared in the past, so with the new royal line:

The Visigoths whose lineage kingly,
Whose feats of war and mighty reign
Were so exalted—
What divers ways did all and singly
Drop down to the obscure again
And were defaulted!
Some through their worthlessness (How lowly
And base among the rabble came
Their estimation!)
Whilst others, as a refuge solely,
In offices they only shame
Maintain their station.

He asks, after the fashion of Francis Villon, his contemporary (1431-1489), of the fate of the weak and luxurious monarch he had served in his youth, Juan II.:

His jousts and tourneys where they vaunted
With trappings, and caparison,
And armor sheathing—
Were they but phantasies that taunted—
But blades of grass that vanished on
A summer's breathing?
What of the dames of birth and station,
Their head-attire, their sweeping trains,
Their vesture scented?
What of the gallant conflagration
They made of lovers' hearts whose pains
Were uncontented?
And what of him that troubadour
Whose melting lutany and rime
Made all their pleasure?
Ah, what of her who danced demure,
And trailed her robes of olden time
So fair a measure?

Of the King Don Enrique IV. he tells us a further story, of luxury on its way into the grave, of the high promise of his reign, that ended only in his deposition and personal degradation:

His golden bounties without stinting,
The strongholds and the lairs of kings
With treasure glutted;
The flagons of their wassail glinting,
The sceptre's orbs, and crowns, and rings
With which they strutted;

The steeds, the spurs, the bits to rein them,
The pillions draped unto the ground
Beneath their paces—
Ah, whither must we fare to gain them—
That were but as the dews around
The meadow places!

His archenemy, whom he had attacked bitterly enough, both in the field and with the pen, is now the object only of sympathy and pathos:

And then Don Alvaro, Grand-Master
And Constable, whom we have known
When loved and dreaded—
What need to tell of his disaster
Since we behold him overthrown
And swift beheaded?
His treasures that defied accounting,
His manors, and his feudal lands,
And boundless power—
What more than tears were their amounting?
What more than bonds to tie his hands
At life's last hour?

The litany of desolation rolls along with the names of princes, grand masters and notables:

And what of all their power and prize
That touched the very peaks of fame
That none could limit?—
A conflagration 'gainst the skies
Till at its brightest ruthless came
Death's hand to dim it.
Their followers' unnumbered hosting
The pennon and the battle-flag
And bannered splendor?
The castles with their turrets boasting,
Their walls and barricades that brag
And mock surrender?
The cavern's ancient crypt of hiding,
The secret passage, vault, or stair—
What use affords it?
Since thou, upon thy onslaught striding,
Canst send, O Death, an arrow where
No buckler wards it!

But idle pomp and worldly precaution are not all that must fail the mortal; even the glory of true knighthood and noble service on earth are hardly of more avail. The poet describes the virtues and successes of the Grand Master, his struggles against adverse fortune and the honest merit through which he won his way:

He left no weighty chests of treasure
Nor hardly unto wealth attained
Nor store excelling;
To fight the Moors was all his pleasure,
And thus his fortresses he gained,
Demesne and dwelling,
With feats so mighty that Hispania
Can never make account of all
In numbers mortal—
Till to his township of Ocaña
Came Death at last to strike and call
Against his portal:
"Good Cavalier," he cried, "divest you
Of all this hollow world of lies
And soft devices;
Let your old courage now attest you,
And show a breast of steel that vies
In this hard crisis."

Death goes on to explain to him that only half the terrors and pains are for those whose lives on earth have been dutiful, delivering a forceful presentation of the problem of mortality as it appears from the other side of the grave. Then, with a brusqueness that seems as if it might be biographical, the sturdy Grand Master addresses the terrible visitant:

Waste we not here the final hours
This puny life can now afford
My mortal being;
But let my will in all its powers
Conformable approach the Lord
And His decreeing.
Unto my death I yield—contenting
My soul to put the body by
In peace and gladness;
The thought of man to live, preventing
God's loving will that he should die,
Is only madness.
And thus, his hopes so nobly founded,
His senses clear and unimpaired
So none could doubt him—
With spouse and offspring fond surrounded,
His kinsmen, and his servants bared
And kneeling 'round him—
He gave his soul to Him who gave it
(May God in heaven ordain it place
And share of glory!)
And left our life, as balm to save it,
And dry the tears upon our face,
His deathless story.

It was so they lived and died in the old days in Spain, breaking a final lance with the dread Rider on the White Horse, a proudly humble challenge of their lips. It was not until Louis XIV., and in another land, that men learned how to pass into eternity with a *bon-mot* and die in the manner of Versailles. The passages we have translated show as well as may be in another tongue the qualities and verse arrangement of the original, which needs no encomium, even should it not possess as large a renown in English as it deserves.

Of the Manriques little more remains to be said beyond what is contained in the proudest pages of old Spanish genealogies and annals of Church and State. The famous name of Manrique de Lara again occurred in the literature of the seventeenth century, when Luisa Magdalena, Countess of Paredes, acted as instructress for the Infanta Maria Teresa, who later became Queen of France. This descendant of Don Rodrigo and Jorge Manrique completes the tryptich of warrior, poet and saint that constitutes the history of every great family of Spain; for entering the rigid cloister of the Discalced Carmelites of Malagón she became famous for her virtues, as well as for poems, under the name of Madre Luisa Magdalena de Jesus, her literary masterpiece being "El Año Santo," or "Meditations for Every Day of the Year, Morning, Noon and Night" (Madrid, 1658), a work that earned the praises of Juan

Palafrox, editor of St. Teresa's letters. She has the great literary distinction of figuring in the "Catalogue of the Authorities of the Spanish Language," and she seems a not unworthy *Amen* to the great litany of the Manriques.

THOMAS WALSH.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THROUGH THE WEST INDIES TO THE PANAMA CANAL.

A VAST array of illustrious names emblazons the escutcheon of the Roman peninsula, and there can be no question that long after the division and subdivision of every nation now extant, in the distant cycle that has yet to pierce the horizon of to-morrow, these characters shall still invest the seat of learning, the hall of legislation, the harbor and the mart of commerce. Standing out in high relief, a giant amidst a lilliputian band, there shall be found a Titan of colossal size, one whose intrepidity gave to the world a mighty continent destined to change the routes of all the seas, the chronologies and conditions of every race beneath the cerulescent dome on high—Cristoforo Colombo, Commodore Captain of the Spanish Main. What that fearless sailor and his one hundred and twenty able seamen endured in braving the passage across the tremendous breadth of the Atlantic seas in caravels thrice the length of a modern lifeboat is known only to those whose wanderlust has taken them through tropical waters during the turbulent days of autumn; and the tourist who is fortunate enough to spend two months among our friends of the Southland is generous in his plaudits of the dauntless Genoese. The itinerary embraced visits to the Crescent Isle, over the hills and vales of fair Jamaica, up the Magdalena to the tip-top of South America, across the heights of Costa Rica, and along that great work of the American engineer—the Panama Canal.

In the afternoon of the fourth day the binoculars discerned the outlines of the Cuban coast, and the following morning all hands were up at sunrise to view the passage of the narrow strait connecting the placid waters of Havana Bay with the vast and buoyant Gulf of Mexico. To the left we beheld the giant lighthouse whose glowing beacon has flashed forth its warning message to generations of storm-tossed mariners; to the rear the grim walls of Morro Castle rose in sombre impotence, for the citadel has played its part and now peacefully sends across the deep the mystic symbols to those afloat. The harbor is a commodious basin, but until recently

was so shallow that the larger vessels anchored in midstream to load and unload their cargoes. This reproach has been partly removed, and immense improvements along the docks will enable the deepest ships to cast their hawsers to modern piers. Havana of to-day bears but slight resemblance to the city of years gone by. Able American engineers have transformed the ancient capital into a place of health and beauty, and the residents now boast a driveway and promenade that has no superior, the magnificent Malecon, signifying a seawall, which extends for miles along the curving shore of the Mexican Gulf. On Sunday afternoon those who appear on the pages of "Cuba's Who's Who"—as well as those of lesser station—drive up and down and then around Malecon and Prado in countless carriages, automobiles and equipages of every make and age. It is a moving panorama worth traveling many leagues to view. Visitors seem transported to a miniature Boulevard des Italiens as they note the carefree throngs that eat, drink and make merry in the brilliant cafés and places of amusement along the broad and handsome Prado when the shades of eventide have been drawn across the "Paris of the Indies." Streets in the old section are exceedingly narrow (twenty-six feet from wall to wall), steps of the trolleys reaching over the seven-foot sidewalks in the Calle San Luis Obispo, Calle O'Reilly and other thoroughfares catering to the wants of American travelers. The famous Cathedral in which the body of Columbus reposed after being brought from Santo Domingo, and prior to its transfer to Spain, is a great point of interest. It is sad to relate that the edifice requires a complete renovation within and without its sacred walls. The metropolis contains several modern office buildings, which appear like skyscrapers from the little streets below, and the mansions of the wealthy, especially along the Malecon, are homes of splendor. On the other hand, the one-story dwellings of the working classes are devoid of ornamentation, the iron-barred windows giving them the appearance of penal institutions. The national breakfast is very light, consisting merely of coffee and rolls; and it dissipates an erroneous impression by stating that smoking is strictly confined to men and the lower grades of women. It may be of interest to know that the first railroad bed was laid down here as early as 1834, the tracks now traversing 2,200 miles through the various Provinces, the Havana Central being driven by electricity; an old-fashioned railway station has been supplanted by a beautiful terminal that would be an ornament to any municipality. A three-hour siesta at midday was the accepted routine until the stranger from northern climes decided that such sinful waste should be changed to the American system of one hour for refreshments. The natives as a

class cannot be called homogeneous, the blood coursing through their veins being an admixture of Negro and Spanish, although there are many full-bloods of both races. Spanish merchants control the trade of the city and American residents are numerous enough to support two daily newspapers. The Metropolitan See of Santiago, 530 miles east of Havana, was established as a bishopric by His Holiness Pope Adrian VI. in the year 1522. Augustinian Fathers from Villanova, Pa., are doing good work in St. Augustine's College, where many youths are being carefully trained according to the rules of these well-known educators. The State also conducts the University of Havana, founded by the Jesuits 225 years ago as the College of San Ambrosio. The population of the city has grown since its occupation in 1519 to some 300,000 souls to-day and that of the island to 2,100,000, with an area of 45,000 square miles, or somewhat smaller than England. Transmarine commerce is enormous, last year reaching $230,000,000. Sugar production runs to fabulous figures, about four billion pounds annually. Exports are mainly sugar and tobacco. Manufactures, excepting tobacco products, are almost unknown, with the result that clothing and articles of family use are higher than in the States. Small cigar factories are numerous and employ thousands of men and women, boys and girls. The tourist should remember that the metropolis is an expensive community; indeed the rates at one hotel are not less than $25 per day for a suite of rooms. Clergy and literati have never been known to overtax the capacity of this aristocratic caravansary. Street car service is good and cabs may be hired at twenty cents per ride for any distance within the city limits. Havana has its plaza and fine municipal band, but for some unknown reason it is lacking in the principal institution of a Spanish-American city, a national opera house. However, in order to make amends in this direction, the Government recently ordered the construction of a magnificent building wherein to conduct the affairs of state.

The prevalent impression that Cuba is so unbearably hot that white men cannot withstand the terrific rays of the sun is far from being true, inasmuch as the cooling breezes that float perennially across the island go far to tempering the tropical heat. Within twenty miles of Central Park (the principal plaza) there may be seen a life as primitive as history records, with the exception that the adult aborigines deem a garment of some kind necessary to protect themselves from the heat, though the rising generation of señors and señoras are perfectly satisfied to wear a congenial smile. The huts are built of stout pine branches, the sides covered with cocoanut leaves and the roof of thatch; an iron-barred aperture acts

as a window and the ancient sod as a floor. Nature has been most generous to the Pearl of the Antilles, for three crops of table produce are usually secured. If the coast belt should prove too humid, there are pleasant spots on the imposing Sierra Maestra range, 8,000 feet above the level.

Morro's periodic gleam paled and paled as the blades warmed to the task of skirting the Isle of Pines before the rise of the effulgent orb of day, and then began the pleasant sail along the Caribbean Sea to the quaint and picturesque town of Montego Bay, on the northwestern coast of Jamaica. There is a vast difference between Jamaica and Cuba, for everything bespeaks the rule and customs of the English nation. Even the negroes, who comprise over ninety per cent. of the population, use a dialect germane to backwoods Georgia and that of Trafalgar Square. The island is nearly 150 miles in length and 35 in width. Things were not always as orderly as we find them to-day; the Spaniards raised their ensign in 1509, to be supplanted by the Union Jack in 1670, when Oliver Cromwell dispatched a fleet to this section for the purpose of exploitation. That noblest of all pirates, Sir Henry Morgan, and his fellow-buccaneers made the island their rendezvous while scouring the trade routes for game. Over two hundred years ago a tidal wave, caused by seismic shocks, swept high above Port Royal and sent it far below the surface of the sea. Seventeen million bunches of bananas make a pretty tidy crop for twelve months' work, and they keep many ships moving in and out of many harbors. Cocoanuts to the number of 21,000,000 and 50,000,000 oranges are annually sent to northern lands. Years ago rats devastated the sugar region to such a degree that the mongoose, a small animal of the rat species, was imported to destroy the rodents. It did most valiant work, but multiplied so enormously that the authorities are now at their wits' end looking for something to destroy the mongoose. An English garrison is located up in the cool of the mountains, while the native regiment has its headquarters near the capital. His Lordship the Governor General also dwells in regal style at King's House, five miles beyond the metropolitan limits, the beautiful gardens presenting every variety of flora known to the region. Vegetation is tropical, sub-tropical and temperate, making it possible to dine on rhubarb and celery, asparagus and cauliflower, strawberries and cranberries each and every day of the year. Heart disease is not a characteristic ailment of the aborigines; indeed, they take pains not to allow anything to perturb their equanimity—not even toil; for as soon as they acquire a few shillings they require a vacation long enough to properly disburse it all.

Montego Bay is perhaps the most archaic spot on the island. It is a fair-sized town of 10,000 people, and the quaintness of the place is greatly embellished by the picturesque habitations of the early Spanish settlers. Women display far more animation than men, driving carts, wheeling barrows, hawking long ropes of tobacco and smoking big black cigars with the *sang froid* of a veteran. The railway ride to Kingston, 140 miles distant, is filled with vistas of tropical enchantment. The road zigzags up the heights of the Blue Mountains, whose tallest pinnacle soars aloft 7,500 feet above the shore. In the ascent across the undulating hills and elevated tablelands, foaming cascades and canyons of profound depths the sunlit air begins to cool, light overcoats and wraps being finally brought into requisition. It has been said that Columbus, after traversing this tropical land in 1494, pronounced it an "island paradise;" and it has good reasons for being proud of the title, as the gorgeous landscapes would be difficult to equal, while the temperature is never excessive, due to the lively breezes common to the Caribbean Sea. The Government deserves much praise for its work in road building; one of these fine highways runs all around both coasts and is intersected by others at various points. Hotels of grandeur dot the little isle, with beautiful lawns running down to the rolling sea. These hostelries are mainly supported by rich Americans who follow the trail of the departing sun and bathe in summer seas when others are following the trail along the frozen path. Port Antonio, on the northern coast, is the centre of the banana trade. The town is ideally situated, and contains many "hotels" and at least one that is a real inn of great attraction. Much rivalry exists between "Antone" and the other watering places, all of which claim to possess merits far outshining their competitors.

Kingston, the capital, has a population of 60,000 and is so English that the dress suit is the irrevocable rule at the evening meal. Moreover, the domicile that can claim the slightest distinction in the way of a double gate or a ten-foot "lawn" bears the nomenclature of some noble house of Britain. Hence we find a modest little cottage, surrounded by a picket fence, styled "Marlborough Villa" or perhaps "Abercrombie Hall." Of course, there are residences of superior style and dignity, while stores are large and well-stocked. The principal market could readily be patterned after by our American municipalities, for it is large, airy and trim. The main business thoroughfare is wide and clean, and contains several buildings of importance. Trolleys take the tourist on many pleasant little trips to agreeable spots in the suburban sections. "Clarks" in the shops are generally colored women of the better grade, and those

less cultured sit cross-legged on the streets and hammer mortar off the bricks from the buildings which fell during the cataclysm of 1907, among them the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity. Bishop Collins, however, lost no time in securing funds for the erection of the present beautiful structure. Catholics are not numerous in the interior, for of the 900,000 people on the island, less than 20,000 profess the ancient faith, their spiritual needs being under the care of the Jesuits. St. George's College is also supervised by the sons of Loyola, and the Sisters conduct an academy for the education of young ladies. The principal hotel is a handsome structure, and has a fine view of the ocean front; there are also smaller places with comfortable quarters and reasonable terms. There is not the least doubt that the little black boys who cavort in and around the waters of the harbor take the palm at long-distance diving, floating and swimming. They reach their place of business early in the morning and remain throughout the day, even securing their meals from the kind-hearted stewards who fling hardtack, loaves and other eatables at their ebony heads. They catch every coin that comes within a reasonable radius, and dive far down into the depths for those they miss. If a sixpence should be cast too far afield, they scramble hand-over-hand to the spot and then disappear like so many lumps of coal. A few minutes later a little black face bubbles above the surface, with the cry, "Thank'ee, mister; t'row us a 'bob' dis time."

Puerto Colombia lies 400 miles due south of Kingston, and cannot claim to be an ideal harbor, as it faces an open roadstead and is so shallow that the English company owning the railroad to Barranquilla, the chief "seaport" of Colombia, was compelled to build a pier nearly a mile in length to enable ships to transfer their cargoes to the waiting freight cars. The place contains a few shacks called houses, the roofs of which are covered with thatch. Small children dwell close to nature, while their dark-skinned mothers bake the family bread in primitive ovens made of clay. Barranquilla, sixteen miles from the coast, is a modern city of fifty thousand inhabitants, and its fair-sized stores and rich-appearing residences betoken much prosperity. It is the terminus of the various steamboat lines running up the Magdalena River and also acts as the mart of exchange in connection with transmarine commerce. Everything is Spanish—religion, language and customs—but there is a good sprinkling of foreigners, especially Germans, who control the trade of the Republic. The sun shines with equatorial brilliancy when soaring to the meridian, and during the three-hour siesta avenidas and calles are as devoid of animation as Charing Cross, Champs Elysées, Unter den Linden or Broadway are alive with the nerve-racking now-or-never of the temperate

zone. Not a biped of any color, nor a quadruped of any species ventures beyond the little one-story, iron-barred, plastered habitations until the terrific heat of midday has been assuaged by the cooling zephyrs that wing across the city in the hours of diurnal decay. At the stroke of six the sunset gun sends forth its booming notes, and within an hour the Zocala fills with the gay Lothario, embonpoint dueña and æsthetic señorita, for along the lengthy banks of the noble Magdalena, as in places not remote, the demoiselle who tips the beam beyond the ten-stone limit shatters all the ideals of refined society. Along the plaza they stroll and chat, the señors emitting great clouds of the noxious weed, the young ladies flashing glances of Andalusian hue. They are of every rank and every class, and judging from their loquacity and gesticulations, one and all are filled to overflowing with a store of knowledge somewhat more profound than an encyclopedia of unabridged dimensions. At nine o'clock the silver-throated chimes roll merrily above the lively throng, and lo! the promenaders avaunt like Banquo's spectre before the affrighted glare of Cawdor's Thane.

Bogotá, a capital of 110,000 inhabitants, reposes nearly nine thousand feet above the level, and the tourist must prepare for a long but interesting seven-day trip up the Magdalena, navigable for nearly 900 miles from its mouth, the fare being fifty-five dollars to or from the city of Barranquilla. River steamers are quite large and comfortable, but win no laurels at record-breaking. Alligators swarm by the million up and down the big stream, and the official figures state that 30,000 to 40,000 of these reptiles are yearly slaughtered for the export trade. After five days have elapsed the sightseer leaves the boat at La Dorado and proceeds to Beltran by rail. Once again he departs from terra firma and sails for Girardot, to once more entrain for Bogotá, fifty-two miles further. The break in the river journey at La Dorado is to overcome the difficulties of climbing the roaring falls immediately above that point. All this seems a cumbersome and ancient method of transportation; but the early travelers did not even have the accommodations we find at our disposal to-day. Within the last twenty years everything was hauled up the mountains on muleback—passengers as well as freight—and it should not be forgotten that Bogotá is nearly two miles above sea level. But the trip is worth while, for views that would require a page to describe are beheld at every twist of the roaring train. A prominent resident stated that the reason why the Spaniards went so far up the hilltops to found the capital was because they did not wish to be annoyed by invading armies. Their wish has been gratified to its completest fulfillment, for even Napoleon or Hannibal might balk at climbing those lofty

crags. Bogotá enjoys a glorious climate, the mercury generally hovering around 65 degrees; the nights, of course, are cool, sometimes cold. Surrounded by high mountain peaks, the tallest being the snow-capped Tolima, nearly 19,000 feet above the level, the metropolitan city is divided into four parts by the San Francisco and San Augustin Rivers, which are crossed by a score of bridges. Streets cross at right angles and are generally well paved and clean. An electric street car line, owned by the municipality, renders good service to the traveling public. The Avenida de la Republica is the principal thoroughfare, the Avenida de la Colon being a good second. Around the Plaza de la Constitucion are found the Federal buildings and the magnificent Corinthian Cathedral, services at the latter being well attended, for the ancient faith finds a responsive chord in the hearts of the Colombian people. Everything in the city bespeaks the Spaniard—customs and architecture. Some fine specimens of ancient Inca civilization are found in the Museum. The Observatory, conducted by the Jesuits, is of international repute, and the National University is turning out a group of young men whose talents should aid in the material and intellectual development of their country. Church and State are separate, but the Government supports religion, and education is supervised by the Bishops of the Catholic Church.

Pamphlets were being printed in the old capital as early as 1738, and it is said that not less than seventy-five periodicals of various kinds are regularly turned out in the metropolis. With an area of 450,000 square miles, the country supports a population of about 4,500,000, or about ten to a square mile, and when it is known that Colombia possesses almost every mineral from coal to emeralds, and that in great abundance, not to speak of every kind of climate from torrid to frigid, it brings home to us that the future of this most favored land should be one of enormous possibilities. Lack of communication and periodical revolutions have hampered the growth of the Republic in times gone by, but there is good reason for believing that a new era has dawned that will prove conducive to the well-being of what was formerly known as New Granada.

Before attempting a necessarily brief survey of the fifty-mile link that is destined to change the commercial routes of the whole civilized world, as well as to dim or illumine the prestige and affluence of many nations now of high and low degree, it should be known that the consummation of the Panama Canal is the dream of centuries and is coincident with Balboa's discovery of the Pacific in 1513. King, the able author of *Wonders of the World,* states that "In the town library of Nuremberg is preserved a globe, made by Johann Schöner in 1520. It is remarkable that the passage

through the Isthmus of Darien, so much sought after in later times, is on this globe carefully traced." The historian Gomera advocated the union of the oceans in 1550; and it has been recorded that the Dutch prepared plans for the same work upwards of two hundred years ago. The cutting through the waist of the earth was such a popular theme that the ubiquitous Munchausen consigned to paper a most remarkable and interesting prediction in 1786. It preceded Goethe's prophecy by a generation, and runs as follows:

"On our arrival at the Isthmus of Darien, sensible of what general benefit it would be to mankind, I immediately formed a plan of cutting a canal across the isthmus from sea to sea. For this purpose I drove my chariot with the greatest impetuosity repeatedly from shore to shore, in the same track, tearing up the rocks and earth thereby, and forming a tolerable bed for the water. Gog and Magog next advanced at the head of a million of people from the realm of North and South America, and from Europe, and with infinite labor cleared away the earth and rocks that I had plowed up with my chariot. I then again drove my chariot, making the canal wider and deeper, and ordered Gog and Magog to repeat their labor as before. The canal being a quarter of a mile broad and three hundred yards in depth, I thought it sufficient and immediately let in the waters of the sea. I did imagine that from the rotary motion of the earth on its axis from west to east, the sea would be higher on the eastern than the western coast, and that on the uniting of the two seas there would be a strong current from the east, and it happened just as I expected. The sea came in with tremendous magnificence, and enlarged the bonds of the canal, so as to make a passage of some miles broad from ocean to ocean, and make an island of South America. Several sail of trading vessels and men-of-war sailed through this new channel to the South Seas and China, and saluted me with all their cannon as they passed. Thus having wedded the Atlantic Ocean to the South Sea, I returned to England."

The Isthmus of Tehuantepec, at the extreme southern end of Mexico, was long favored by the Spaniards, and it is known that Cortés had a survey made about 1530 for a canal to link the Gulf with the Pacific. The isthmus at this point is 120 miles wide, and the project was held in abeyance and finally abandoned upon the completion of the railroad from Vera Cruz to Salina Cruz twenty-eight years ago. The Nicaraguan route had many adherents, and in 1889 the Nicaraguan Canal Company, an American concern, undertook the work of sailing ships from coast to coast via the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua, the latter being 110 feet above the level. This projected highway was to have been 170 miles in

length, of which 142 miles passed through the river and lake, leaving 28 miles to be excavated. Much money was expended in dredging, pier building and railway construction. The United States Commissioners estimated that $130,000,000 would be required. Financial difficulties resulted in the liquidation of the company. Ferdinand de Lesseps, the able French engineer who supervised the construction of the Suez Canal, undertook the task of snapping the rock-ribbed strip binding the vast empires of the North and South. He had linked Orient with Occident in the remarkably short space of ten years and six months; but it will be recalled that the Suez route, although one hundred miles in length, passes through three lakes fifty-eight miles long. There was little blasting to be done, inasmuch as the earth was generally of a sandy nature; moreover, the highest elevation cut through did not exceed fifty feet above the level, nor is it as wide or deep as our isthmian channel. The Culebra Cut at Panama is about nine miles long and at one point the hill was 320 feet above the bed of the canal. De Lesseps was handicapped in many ways. In the first place, an engineering task of the greatest possible magnitude, through a tropical land where pestilential diseases abound, required much preliminary work in the way of sanitation prior to the inauguration of activities. Again, the surveys were not made along the most useful and economical lines, nor could such a gigantic project be successfully carried through without the backing of a powerful government. It should also be understood that the toylike machinery at the disposal of the engineer of twenty-five years ago was not to be compared with the mammoth engines, dredges, steam-shovels and other tools now at the command of our American diggers. After years of incapacity, mismanagement and pestilence, the French shareholders lost the large sum of $300,000,000, and much of the costly machinery, valued at $30,000,000, lay idle for twenty years and finally rusted into uselessness. It should be said, however, that Colonel George W. Goethals, the eminent chief engineer of the Canal Commission, has found available about 30,000,000 of the 78,000,000 cubic yards excavated by the Gallic workers.

After satisfactory arrangements were completed for the purchase of the French company's rights for $40,000,000, negotiations with the Republic of Colombia were carried on to secure other necessary rights and privileges not held by the French company. After a long delay, a treaty was formulated, which was rejected by Colombia in 1903. The Province of Panama, an integral part of Colombia, thereupon seceded and organized an independent republic with an area of about 31,000 square miles and a population which at present is stated to be 419,000. This resulted in the negotiation of a satis-

factory treaty with the new Republic of Panama, including the payment, under certain terms, of $10,000,000 by the United States to the Republic of Panama and an annual payment of $250,000 beginning nine years after the signing of the treaty. Under this treaty the United States guaranteed the independence of the Republic of Panama and secured absolute control over what is now called the Canal Zone, a strip of land about ten miles in width, with the Canal through the centre, and forty-five miles in length from sea to sea, with an area of about 450 square miles. The total cost of the whole work will reach nearly $400,000,000, and October 15, 1913, is the tentative date set for the passage of the first vessel. The formal opening, however, will occur January 1, 1915. The total excavation will reach 250,000,000 cubic yards.

It would require a volume of literature to convey a true conception of the magnitude of the isthmian span between the Caribbean's roll and the Pacific's swell, for it is undoubtedly the greatest work the dauntless engineer has as yet attempted in conquering problems that have baffled and defied the mind and muscle of man. The entire length of the Canal from deep water in the Atlantic to deep water in the Pacific is about fifty miles. Its length from shore line to shore line is about forty miles. In passing through it from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a vessel will enter the approach channel in Limon Bay, which will have a bottom width of 500 feet and extend to Gatun, a distance of about seven miles. At Gatun it will enter a series of three locks in flight, varying from 25 to 30 feet, and be lifted 85 feet to the level of Gatun Lake. The ship may steam at full speed through this lake, in a channel varying from 1,000 to 500 feet in width, for a distance of about 24 miles, to Bas Obispo, where it will enter the Culebra Cut. It will pass through the Cut, a distance of about nine miles, in a channel with a bottom width of 300 feet, to Pedro Miguel. There it will enter a lock and be lowered 30 feet to a small lake, at an elevation of 54 feet above sea level, and will pass through this for about one and a half miles to Miraflores. There it will enter two locks in series and be lowered to sea level, passing out into the Pacific through a channel about eight and one-half miles in length, with a bottom width of 500 feet. The depth of the approach channel on the Atlantic side, where the maximum tidal oscillation is over two feet, will be 41 feet at mean tide, and on the Pacific side, where the maximum oscillation is 21 feet, the depth will be 45 feet at mean tide.

Throughout the first 16 miles from Gatun, the width of the lake channel will be 1,000 feet, then for four miles it will be 800 feet and for four miles more, to the northern entrance to Culebra Cut

at Bas Obispo, it will be 500 feet. The depth will vary from 85 to 45 feet. The water level in the Cut will be that of the lake, the depth 45 feet and the bottom width of the channel 300 feet.

The lock gates will be steel structures 7 feet thick, 65 feet long and from 47 to 82 feet high. In the construction of the locks it is estimated that there will be used approximately 5,000,000 barrels of cement. Electricity will be used to tow all vessels into and through the locks and to operate all gates and valves, power being generated by water turbines from the head created by Gatun Lake. Vessels will not be permitted to enter or pass through the locks under their own power.

Three hundred feet is the minimum bottom width of the Canal. This width begins about half a mile above Pedro Miguel locks and extends about eight miles through Culebra Cut, with the ex ception that at all angles the channel is widened sufficiently to allow a thousand-foot vessel to make the turn. The Cut has eight angles, or about one to every mile. The water surface of the lake will be maintained during the rainy season at 87 feet above sea level, making the minimum channel depth in the Canal 47 feet. As navigation can be carried on with about 41 feet of water, there will be stored for dry season surplus over five feet of water. Making due allowance for evaporation, seepage, leakage at the gates and power consumption, this would be ample for 41 passages daily. The Suez Canal passes about 17 vessels per day, with a total yearly tonnage of 21,000,000. According to conservative calculations, the Canal as designed will have ample water supply for as many lockages per day as can be passed through the Canal, which is estimated to be 48 for the twin locks. This will amount to fully 80,000,000 tons per annum, or 15,000,000 greater than our entire foreign tonnage in 1911, and the Canal will not be called upon to take care of tonnage in excess of this amount until a very distant day. Should the time ever come when greater capacity is needed, other locks paralleling the present ones could be built, and the storage of additional water to carry over the dry season could be obtained from a dam at Alhajuela.

There are in use 100 steam-shovels that lift from one to five cubic yards of material at every dip; 315 locomotives; 560 drills; 4,346 cars; 19 pile-drivers; 20 dredges; 57 cranes; 12 tugboats; 70 barges; besides a hundred or more machines of every description. The number of men employed has averaged about 35,000, of whom 5,000 are Americans.

The United States Government has spent several million dollars in giving the Zone thorough sanitation and erected home and boarding houses for its army of diggers. The various "town sites" along

the route contain model homes for a tropical community. Everything is built above the ground, so as to allow the fresh air—and there is an abundance of it on the Isthmus—to invade the innermost recesses, while wire netting all around the verandas protects the sleeper during his nocturnal rest. The Government also operates the Commissary Department, where foodstuffs may be bought at twenty per cent. less than in the States. There are eighteen hotels along the line for white employees, at which good meals are served for thirty cents, the visitor paying half a dollar for the same service. At Panama the Government has erected a magnificent hotel, the Tivoli, where accommodations may be secured at reasonable rates. Climatic conditions are more favorable than many are wont to believe because of its nearness to the equator. The temperature ranges between 70 and 80 degrees, rarely climbing beyond 90. Rainfalls are frequent and heavy, the precipitation averaging 133 inches a year.

The engineers' calculations as to the sufficiency of the water supply have been amply vindicated. The great Gatun Lake accumulates weekly during the rainy season about five and one-half billion cubic feet of water. Every time a ship is locked through the Canal 5,500,000 cubic feet of water must pass, and when the lake is full it will afford enough water to fill the locks 150 times daily, which is at least twice as fast as the ships can pass. When the surface of the lake reaches its maximum height of eighty-seven feet above sea level, with the water just flowing over the crest of the dam, it will contain the enormous amount of 192,250,000,000 cubic feet of water.

The new route will bring Yokohama 1,500 miles closer to New York than to Liverpool, while Melbourne will be 1,000 and Sydney 1,800 miles nearer the metropolis. The New York captain bound for the South Seas can make Auckland in 8,550 miles, while the British skipper will require 11,350 for the voyage; and the trade of Australasia is worth seeking, for the 5,500,000 inhabitants of the Antipodes in 1911 imported merchandise valued at $380,000,000, of which our share amounted to a paltry $38,000,000, or ten per cent. of the sum total, the lion's share going to a far-away island in the North Atlantic Ocean.

The countries of the west coast of South America are on the alert for the opening of the new route, as it will mean immense opportunities for great commercial expansion because of decreased ocean transportation. The press of Chile, Peru and Bolivia considers the Canal the most important and far-reaching factor that has come up within the history of their respective republics. Railroads from Chile to Bolivia are extending and sending out feeders,

which in turn are reaching terminals of Bolivian railways and they in turn are connecting up the lines of Ecuador. The Governments of these three countries are giving every aid and facility to the extension of present lines and in every way favoring the laying down of new ones. Their commerce amounts to over $350,000,000 annually, and can easily, with increased facilities of ocean transportation at decreased rates, be doubled.

Colonel Goethals is on record as saying that Panama is destined to become the greatest depot on the seas for the disposal of coal to needy ships. Some idea of the amount that will be needed by transient ships may be gained from the fact that the Canaries handle $5,000,000 worth annually. England's coal exports aggregate about $200,000,000, while in addition 20,000,000 tons are "shipped for the use of British steamers engaged in the foreign trade." It is expected that $10,000,000 will not cover the oil and coal traffic at Panama.

The volume of trade now passing over the tracks of the Panama Railroad is nothing short of stupendous. This is shown by the number of ships arriving at the port of Colon during 1911, and it is regrettable to note that of the 700 vessels entered only a small percentage flew the Stars and Stripes. At present soundbound cargo is landed at Colon, sent by rail to Panama, and there transshipped to points on the western coast. The railroad was opened in 1855, and the fare for many years was $25 across the Isthmus—over fifty cents per mile! The time of passage was four hours. The present fare is $2.40 and time of transit two hours and a quarter. From 1853 to 1895, inclusive, the company paid dividends in stock and cash amounting to $37,800,000, or over 600 per cent. and averaging a little less than fifteen per cent. per annum.

The pessimists, both at home and abroad, have placed the seal of doom on the greatest engineering feat of modern times, but the Canal will be in full operation in 1915, and what is more, its operation will be as successful and beneficial as the work of the Frenchmen at Suez. But American merchants cannot afford to be neglectful of the advantages and disadvantages presented to them by the work at Panama, and the words of Hon. John Barrett, Director of the Pan-American Union, and perhaps the greatest authority on Latin-American customs and commerce, are well worthy of consideration. Mr. Barrett recently returned from a tour of Europe and gave expression to the following remarks regarding the famous waterway:

"I am emphatic in saying that American manufacturers must wake up, and that speedily, if they are to hold the mastery of the Panama Canal trade against Europe. I looked into the ports, the

manufactories and exports in the big cities, and I am convinced that unless the people of the United States will wake up they will find the Europeans ready to assume the mastery in trade through the Canal. Business houses and manufacturers are getting ready on an enormous scale everywhere and are keeping alive for the opening of the Canal. The general field of Europe is far ahead of the United States and ahead of South America as a whole. Not only are the business men, shippers, exporters and shipbuilders of Europe humming with this activity, but the governments of Europe are doing the same thing."

The northbound "fruiters" find Port Limon a profitable port of call, for the banana crop is so great that two ships a day could readily be loaded to the line. Excepting on the southern entrance to the harbor, the town is at the mercy of the open sea. Docking facilities are above the ordinary, being built by a large American fruit company that practically controls the vast banana trade of the Republic. The principal object of interest that attracts the tourist is the loading of the countless thousands of green bananas that ascend from wharf to deck on an appliance constructed on the lines of a moving staircase. Two stevedores on the deck roll the large bunches to men below, and they in turn keep the fruit moving downward after the fashion of an endless chain. Forty thousand bunches are thus handled in the space of ten hours, with two gangs feeding the hatches fore and aft. The town itself is of little importance, for it is in the centre of the rain belt, which sometimes means an inundation copious enough to float a fair-sized battleship.

The railroad ride to San José is one of tropical and sub-tropical grandeur, the engine doing heavy drilling in its steep climb up and around the curving, twisting rails that lead to the metropolis, one hundred miles to the west. Six hours are required to make the ascent, for the city is five thousand feet above the level of the earth, and at a point nine miles distant the track reaches an altitude of six thousand feet. The seat of legislation is built on a level plateau, surrounded by undulating ridges, and the climatic conditions are most agreeable. Midday is never excessively hot and the nights are always cool enough for sheet and blanket. Being of Spanish blood, the Costa Ricans love music and song, so they spent a million and a half in the erection of the National Opera House, a theatre of regal magnificence, thus displaying great musical development on the part of 40,000 citizens of the capital of a little nation that claims a population of 400,000 souls. The building, illuminated by an enormous number of electric lights, is so arranged that the entire floor can be raised to one level for public and private functions. It was here that the lavish banquet and ball in honor of

Secretary Knox were held. The Cathedral, a noble edifice, stands alone and faces a beautiful zocala, the Parque Morazan, wherein are to be found a thousand species of plant life. Although the bulk of the populace are of Spanish descent, the Bishop of the see is a German, the Right Rev. Gaspar Storck.

It is not hyperbole to say that there are but few cities of the same size that display more animation or progressiveness than we find in San José. Bananas and coffee have produced an élite second to none, and their sons and daughters are generally educated in the United States and Europe. One-story houses are the rule, and many of these are of adobe; but on the Calle Real there are handsome domiciles surrounded by tropical gardens. The town has its aristocratic suburbs, which are reached by the trolley line, and it is a peculiar fact that this bustling little metropolis boasts the only electric car service south of Mexico City in North America. Heavy shutters, iron bars and the grilles reminiscent of mediæval Spain, such as one sees in many old colonial towns of Central and South America, are conspicuous by their absence in San José. It will be recalled that Cartago was devastated by earth shocks early in 1910, when the Arbitration Palace built by Mr. Andrew Carnegie at a cost of $250,000 was shaken down. The climate is healthy and fresh, and the residents deserve unbounded praise for their efforts to dig away the débris and erect a newer and finer city.

While less than five hundred miles of railway now handle the trade of Costa Rica, the day is not far distant when the three Americas will be linked by bonds of steel. It will take time to forge the heavy links uniting the South American continent with Hudson Bay; but things look bright for such a hopeful consummation in the way of annihilating time and developing the interior of all the countries concerned. The men behind this vast undertaking are connected with an American company which is interested in the commercial exploitation of Central America, where it holds great fruit plantation concessions. The cost of 535 miles of road now being operated by the company was approximately $27,000,000, and the directors have authority to issue stock to the amount of $70,000,000 if necessary to drive the road from Panama to the Mexican frontier. The completion of the plans of the International Railway will do much towards drawing the isthmian republics closer together and will do much in the way of eliminating revolutionary troubles and unrest.

William S. Long.

Camden, N. J.

A ROYAL PATRONESS OF LEARNING:

Margaret Beaufort, Mother of Henry VII. of England.

AMONG the last, if not the last, of those noble women who have carried out in their lives the best ideals of the Middle Ages stands Margaret Beaufort, mother of King Henry VII. Of royal ancestry through her descent from Edward III., she was also the foundress of a royal family that occupied the throne of England for three hundred years. She was born May 31, 1441 (some authorities say 1443), at Bletsoe, in Bedfordshire, her mother being Margaret, only daughter and heiress of Sir John Beauchamp, of Bletsoe, and her father John Beaufort, first Duke of Somerset and grandson of John of Gaunt. He had taken a prominent part in the wars with France, in return for his great services being made Lieutenant of the Duchy of Aquitaine and Captain General of France and Normandy. In 1436 he returned to England, and soon after married the widow of Sir Oliver St. John. Their only child, the subject of this sketch, was destined to add new lustre to an already distinguished family. Possessed of ample means, Margaret's parents kept up at the various manors belonging to them, more especially at Bletsoe, the splendor customary to their rank. Her father died, however, while she was scarcely more than an infant. He had for some time been in disgrace at court, and it is stated by one of the chroniclers of Croyland that in consequence he took his own life, but this is not corroborated by other writers of the period. He was buried at Wimborne, in Dorsetshire, near which place, at Kingston Lacy, the family seems to have been living at this time; after his death the Duchess appears to have returned with her child to Bletsoe. In the fine manor house, built somewhat in the style of a castle, the little Margaret lived with her mother and two half-brothers, being brought up, as we are told, most carefully. It seems not unlikely that Margaret received the same training as the young St. Johns; she early showed signs of the great mental powers with which she had been endowed, and her education was far in advance of that usually given even to women of rank in her day. Probably an ecclesiastic attached to the household of the Duchess of Somerset as chaplain or confessor taught the young people of the family; this was a usual method of education among the upper classes at that time. It is known that she studied French with considerable success and Latin to a certain extent. In later life she was heard to regret that she had not in her youth made herself perfect mistress of that language, though

she appeared to have, as her saintly confessor, Bishop Fisher, says, "well understood the rubric of the ordinal for the saying of the service." Very shortly after her father's death, Margaret, who was one of the greatest heiresses in England, was put under the guardianship of the Duke of Suffolk, though because of her extreme youth she was apparently not removed from her mother's care. Suffolk was exceedingly anxious to secure her as a bride for his son; some authorities claim that the marriage actually took place when she was about nine years of age, though she did not ratify it when old enough to consent. In the meantime Henry VI. proposed a marriage between her and his half-brother, Edmund Tudor, Earl of Richmond. When his proposal was made known to Margaret, it was said that she "asked counsel of an old gentlewoman whom she much loved and trusted," who advised her to "commend herself to St. Nicholas, the patron and helper of all true maidens." Margaret acted upon the advice she had received, "specially that night when she should the morrow after make answer of her mind determinately . . . as she lay in prayer . . . whether waking or sleeping she could not assure; but about four of the clock in the morning one appeared unto her arrayed like a Bishop, and naming unto her Edmund, bade take him unto her husband." Bishop Fisher speaks of this dream being told to her "parents," so the Duchess must by this time have been married to her third husband, Lord Welles. Possibly Margaret was living near the court, after this marriage, under the guardianship of Suffolk. In any case, whether she was under her mother's care or not, the decision of this important matter seems to have been left largely to herself. She ended by choosing the bridegroom of her dream. In the meantime the Duke of Suffolk was accused of treason, and being attainted and banished, his lands and privileges were taken from him; among the latter was the guardianship of the Lady Margaret. Not long after the marriage of the young heiress and Edmund Tudor took place. No account of the ceremony or of Margaret's early life has come down to us. In fact, but for Bishop Fisher's funeral sermon and the various volumes of privy purse expenses of Henry VII. and his Queen, there would be almost no record of the life of this most interesting woman. There are, of course, full accounts of her foundations at the University of Cambridge. There, indeed, every allusion to her is cherished with an almost reverent interest. But in this period of transition in England, when printing had just been introduced, it was far too expensive to be used in recording the ordinary events of life. At the same time, clerks who wrote by hand found the new art superseding their own; their numbers, consequently, grew less year by year. Thus

from both causes we miss the full account of an interesting and important period. It was not until civil peace was restored by the union of the houses of York and Lancaster and the Tudor dynasty firmly established that the records grow complete, as under Henry VIII.

The union of the youthful Margaret with Edmund Tudor took place under the brightest auspices. To many there was a glamor about the son of Owen Tudor, with his reputed descent from the legendary Arthur Pendragon—Henry VII. bore a dragon as his device at Bosworth Field, an act which doubtless increased the enthusiasm of his Welsh followers. The royal birth of Henry's grandmother, that French Katherine, widow of Henry V., who married the gallant Owen Tudor, gave the family a unique position. Henry VI. on becoming King took the greatest interest in his half-brothers, Edmund and Jasper. He saw that they were "carefully educated under the most honest and virtuous ecclesiastics" and brought to court at a suitable age. The year after his brother's betrothal the King gave him the "county of Richmount, or Richmondshire, in the North Riding of York," making him an Earl and granting him in virtue of his near relationship to royalty the further privilege of sitting in Parliament next to dukes. Besides receiving other lesser lordships, he was "allowed to keep a chaplain, two esquires, two yeomen and two chamberlains."

A "noble mansion," Baynard's Castle, in London, which had been a residence of the Saxon kings, was also granted; we read of the young couple residing here at one time. Immediately after their marriage, however, they went to the Welsh estates of the Tudors, living principally at Pembroke Castle, in South Wales, the home of Jasper Tudor, Earl of Pembroke, Edmund's younger brother. Here Margaret's only child, Henry, was born. The room in which the future king first saw the light was still in existence some year ago. Leland, the antiquary, says, "In the utter ward I saw the chaumbre where King Henri VII. was borne, in knowledge whereof a chimmeney is new made with the Armes and Badges of King Henri VII." It seems eminently fitting that the birthplace of one of England's greatest kings should be marked in same way; perhaps a "chimmeney new made" is the most appropriate memorial of one who gave his country an era of peace in which each man might enjoy the security of his own fireside—a privilege which certainly had not been his during the three previous reigns.

Margaret's happy married life soon came to an end, her husband dying on the feast of All Saints, 1456. He was buried in the church of the Grey Friars at Caermarthen. When his grandson, Henry VIII., suppressed the monastery, the remains were carried to St.

David's Cathedral and interred within the chancel. Here the following inscription may be read: "Under this marble stone, here enclosed, rest the bones of that noble lord, Edmund, Earl of Richmond, father and brother to kings; who departed out of this world in the year 1456, the first day of November. On whose soul Almighty Jesu have mercy."

Three years after the death of the Earl of Richmond, Margaret married her cousin, Sir Henry Stafford, son of the Duke of Buckingham. The Duke settled a number of manors on the young couple, and as the Lady Margaret held in her own right much property as heiress to both her father and her first husband, she was now a very rich woman indeed. Very little is known of this second marriage, although it lasted for twenty-three years. In his will, dated October 2, 1481, Lord Stafford bequeathed to his son-in-law (?) Henry, "a trapper of four new horse harness;" he appointed his "entirely and best beloved wife, Margaret, Countess of Richmond," sole executrix of his will, and left her the remainder of his property without any restrictions whatever. Such was his confidence in her ability and judgment. He was buried, at his own request, in the church of the College of Plessy, in Essex, founded by his ancestor, Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, sixth son of Edward III.

It appears likely that not only during her early widowhood, but for some years after becoming the wife of Lord Stafford, the Lady Margaret continued to live at Pembroke Castle. Here she was under the immediate protection of her brother-in-law, the Earl of Tudor, who could be relied on to protect the interests of his brother's widow and child. Some such protection was absolutely necessary. The country was in a most unsettled condition during the troublous times of Henry VI. The Beauforts considered themselves as rightful claimants to the throne in case King Henry had no heir. This alone would make their position conspicuous at all times and in periods of unrest positively dangerous; besides, many members of the family held important positions in the kingdom which marked them out for favor or disgrace, according to which side was temporarily in power. Margaret's uncle, the Duke of Somerset, was at one time Prime Minister, but was sent to the Tower by the Protector. The Earl of Tudor was always faithful to the kingly brother to whom he owed so much, so that the fortunes of the Countess of Richmond and her little son were naturally bound up with those of the Lancastrian party and fluctuated with them. Lady Margaret, therefore, with that prudence which all her biographers so much extol, decided to keep her son as far removed as possible from the court and public life. Henry's double relation to the

House of Lancaster made this even more imperative. Wales, with its romantic devotion to the very name of Tudor, was manifestly the safest retreat, and Pembroke Castle was a very strong fortress, so situated as to be able to withstand any ordinary attack, a not entirely impossible contingency in view of the constant fighting going on between the two factions. This seclusion had the further advantage of enabling the Countess to train personally the mind of her young son and develop his character in accordance with her own lofty ideals. All Henry's biographers allude to the admirable tuition bestowed on him by his exemplary and judicious mother.

After the crowning of Edward IV. the youthful Earl was attainted, his possessions taken from him and bestowed on the Duke of Clarence, though the dower rights of the Lady Margaret, as well as the lands inherited from her father, were left to her. Yet she and her son remained more or less objects of suspicion, so that when Sir William Herbert, as a reward for his labors in behalf of the House of York, obtained a grant of the castle, town and lordship of Pembroke, he was ordered to take up his residence there and assume custody of the attainted family. The condition of the young Henry was now practically one of mild imprisonment; probably, however, the presence of young people of his own age, the children of Sir William, was a benefit to him in his secluded life. He seems, too, to have won the affections of his new guardians; contemporary accounts describe him as a lovable boy. It was even proposed that he should in due time marry Maud, one of Sir William's daughters. During the brief interval in 1470 when Henry VI. was temporarily reinstated, Jasper Tudor took his nephew to London and presented him to the King. Young Henry was now fourteen years of age. On being brought before the King—some biographers say at a great banquet in London, others place the meeting at Eton—after he "had beholded him long holding his peace, and marveling at the goodly wit of the child, said in this wise to the nobles that were at that time: 'Lo, this is he, this is he, I say, to whom both we and our adversaries shall give place to in possession.'" The popular belief in the sanctity of King Henry caused much attention to be paid to this prophecy, and while it gave the youthful earl more prominence among his party as a possible heir to the throne, it also made his position more dangerous. The King, too, is said to have advised sending his nephew across the seas for safekeeping. The Lady Margaret saw the wisdom of this advice, and with her characteristic promptness immediately set about carrying it out, though it meant separation for an indefinite time from the object of her dearest affection. Jasper Tudor's own position, even in his native Wales, was a very insecure one, so it was decided that he, as well as the

young Henry, should proceed secretly to Tendy, and there set sail for France, which they accordingly did. But a storm cast them upon the shores of Brittany, and though they were kindly received by Francis, the reigning Duke, the young Earl was detained as a hostage. This mishap was an added blow to the sorrowing mother and put her fortitude to a severe test. But the Duke treated Henry with courtesy, though refusing to allow him to depart, and Margaret must have felt relief in realizing that he was at least safe from the machinations of Edward and Richard, for his detention continued after the latter king's accession, in spite of the efforts made to get control of his person. Fortunately the Countess was able to hold communication with him through her many faithful adherents.

Not long after the death of Sir Henry Stafford, Margaret's mother, the Dowager Duchess of Somerset, also passed away; the Countess, left absolutely alone, married for the third time. There is reason to suppose that Margaret entered into this marriage principally from the desire of benefiting her son by an alliance with one of the greatest nobles of the realm. Thomas, Lord Stanley, Steward of the King's household, Lord of the Isle of Man, a descendant, like Margaret, of John of Gaunt, allied by marriage to the powerful Earl of Warwick, wielded a power scarcely less than that of the throne itself. In addition, his personal character and his great services to the Yorkist cause made him still more prominent. After the marriage Lord Stanley took his wife to Derby House, a magnificent mansion that he had recently built on St. Benet's Hill, London. The sudden death of Edward IV., however, caused an unlooked for change in their lives. Stanley was pledged to support the claims of the young Edward, but his ten-weeks' reign as Edward V. was succeeded by that of the usurper Richard. Richard while Protector had imprisoned Stanley in the Tower on suspicion, but on taking the throne himself he pursued quite a different policy and endeavored to attach this powerful noble to himself by every possible means. Lord Stanley was made Steward of the King's household, and, with his wife, was summoned to take part in the coronation. This ceremony was made as gorgeous as possible, the ugly facts connected with Richard's usurpation being glossed over with an imposing magnificence hitherto unknown. The Queen's train was borne by the Countess of Richmond, while at the banquet that followed in Westminster Hall she took her place with princesses of the blood royal, "not far removed from the Queen's person." We read that there was sent her for this occasion from the royal household "ten yards of scarlet for her livery and a long gown, made of six yards of crimson velvet, purfled, with the same quantity of white cloth of gold, and another long gown made of

six and a half yards of blue velvet, purfled, with equal quantity of crimson cloth of gold." We may be quite sure that the Lady Margaret's gay "purfled" gown—one feels a human curiosity to know what vagary of fashion was so described—covered a heavy heart filled with sorrow for the fate of that dearly loved son, away from his home and country, unjustly deprived of his possessions and freedom.

In accordance with his plan of binding the great Stanley to his cause by favors, Richard soon made him Lord High Constable for life and a member of the Order of the Garter.

And now comes a period in the life of the Countess, when for the first time we hear a note of adverse criticism from one or two of her biographers. She has been accused of duplicity for taking part in the coronation ceremonies and apparently acquiescing in Richard's sovereignty while secretly plotting his downfall. But her king's command to appear at court was not to be disobeyed; indeed, such disobedience might have cost not only her own life, but that of her husband as well. It was obviously impossible for Lord Stanley to absent himself; his devotion to the family of Edward was well known and laid him open to suspicion; Richard's queen, Anne, was his niece by marriage; he had been released from the Tower and had honors heaped upon him by the new king. By every sentiment of loyalty he was bound to support the throne, which he apparently did without disguising his affection for the children of Edward. In the early days of Richard's reign, while her husband was receiving such substantial proofs of the King's favor, the Countess seemed to have pleaded, though in vain, for her son's restoration to his rights. There is nothing to prove, however, that after she had been made a party to Buckingham's designs, she approached the King in any way or appeared publicly in court. She was no doubt aware of the stronger claims of the House of York to the crown, but Henry VI. had been recognized as her legal sovereign, and she had accepted Edward IV., but, as one of her biographers remarks, "in Margaret's eyes Richard was a usurper and a regicide," and all intercession for her son's release having failed, her conscience evidently allowed her to follow the pleadings of her mother's heart. When the Duke of Buckingham, who was Henry Stafford, her nephew by her second marriage, proposed the dethronement of Richard and the placing of Henry on the throne, she entered heartily into the plan and immediately set to work towards its fulfillment. Bishop Morton, of Ely, who had always been a faithful follower of Henry VI. and Edward IV., and who had in fact been imprisoned by Richard in Buckingham's own castle of Brecknock, brought his great experience and wisdom to the aid of the confederates. It was

decided that if a marriage could be arranged between Henry and the Princess Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV., a union which had even been suggested by Edward himself, the crown should be offered to the young Earl. Elizabeth of York, being the legitimate heir of Edward, would bring added strength to her husband's claim and attract many of the discontented Yorkists to his cause. While Richmond was on his way to be crowned at York, the Countess of Richmond started on a pilgrimage to Our Lady of Worcester. The first conference between Buckingham and the Countess seems to have taken place when they met quite by accident at this time. Some writers maintain, however, that it was only after this meeting that Buckingham remembered the presumptive rights of Margaret and her son and then broached the subject to the Countess. In any event, having once determined on her course of action, the Lady Margaret pursued it with characteristic promptness and energy. She sent her Welsh physician, Dr. Lewis, in whom she had absolute confidence, to consult with the unfortunate Queen Elizabeth, then in sanctuary at Westminster. The Queen Dowager eagerly assented to the proposal, sent her daughter's pledge to the exiled Henry and promised to enlist the aid of the most powerful of the Yorkist nobles in their designs. Margaret sent a trusty agent to her son with large sums of money, and efforts were made by Buckingham and other friends of the movement to obtain aid from Brittany, Flanders and other European courts, but in spite of all these efforts the plot failed. The Duke of Buckingham was put to death and all others who were unable to escape were attainted. The Countess of Richmond was not attainted in the general bill, but at the King's instigation Parliament passed a special bill, by which her vast possessions and dignities were taken from her; the act, after stating that the "said Countess made chevesancez of great sums of money . . . to be employed to the execution of the said treason and malicious purpose . . ." goes on to say that "remembering the good and faithful service that Thomas Lord Stanley hath done and intendeth to do to our said sovereign lord and for the good love and trust that the king hath in him . . . remitteth the great punishment of attainder of the said Countess;" but she "was to be kept in some secret place at home, without any servant or company." Thus the Countess, for her share in the uprising, became practically a prisoner in her own house, with her husband as jailer.

Stanley appears to have remained neutral at this time; one would like to believe that he was ignorant of the plot. However, he actually became a party to the second attempt, when Henry landed at Milford Haven, in his native county of Pembrokeshire, August 8, 1485. It is believed that Henry met his mother and Lord Stanley

by appointment before proceeding into Leicestershire, where the opposing forces met at Bosworth. Shakespeare makes use of the tradition as far as the meeting between Richmond and his stepfather are concerned, though the Countess herself does not appear in the drama. In the meantime Stanley had already fallen under Richard's suspicion, and that astute monarch required that Lord Strange, the great soldier's heir, should be delivered to his keeping as a gauge of his father's fidelity. Just before the battle, when Richard sent a message to Stanley threatening to behead his heir if Stanley proved treacherous, the sturdy father sent this reply, worthy of his character as history presents it to us: "Tell King Richard to act as it so pleaseth him—the Lord of the Isle of Man has other sons alive." Fortunately for the brave father, the King was prevented from carrying out this bloody threat before the battle as he had intended, so the young man's life was saved. At the moment of victory it was Stanley who crowned his stepson as King, placing on his head Richard's own crown, found, as tradition says, in a hawthorn bush on the field of battle. Among the devices on Henry's magnificent tomb in the chapel that he built in Westminster may be seen a crown hidden in a bush; his coronation on the battlefield was represented in one of the window lights.

After fourteen years of painful separation the Countess now had her dearest wish gratified; not only was her son restored to her, but largely through her influence and labors he was acknowledged as the rightful King of England, and through his wise marriage the disastrous Wars of the Roses were brought to an end. From henceforth Margaret's connection with public affairs ceases; she who had been called by a contemporary poet, "mother, author, plotter, counsellor of union," is now heard of no more in councils of state, though her son had great respect for her judgment and is known to have consulted her on more than one occasion. Henry was crowned October 30, 1485, the Countess being present. Though it must have been a day of intense happiness to her, yet Fisher says, "she never yet was in that prosperity, but the greater it was, the more always she dreaded the adversity. For when the King, her son, was crowned in all that great triumph and glory, she wept marvelously.' Truly, indeed, did she evince, as one of her biographers says, "the lowly mind possessing yet not possessed by these outward shows." Here indeed lay the secret of her being able to detach herelf so completely from the privileges of her rank to devote herself to the service of those who needed her help, either materially or intellectually.

Immediately after Henry's accession to the throne Parliament met and amongst many statutes repealed the special act of attainder

against Margaret and confirmed the settlements made on her marriage with Stanley, which had been taken away through Richard's action against her. Henry seems always to have felt the greatest love and reverence for his mother and to have shown his affection by many substantial acts. It is a pleasing trait in a character rather cold by nature. Besides the general restoration of her rights granted by Parliament, the King by a special grant "empowered her to sue and be sued as a single woman and to make grants, etc., as if she were unmarried." This was a privilege that hitherto had been reserved to the Queen Consort, and of course left the Countess of Richmond free to devote her wealth to works of charity and the encouragement of learning. When Caxton in 1472 set up his printing press in the precincts of Westminster Abbey she became one of his earliest patrons; she not only bought books from him, but engaged him to print others; some of these she herself translated from the French, others she empowered him to translate.

One of Caxton's earliest works, "The Hystorye of King Blanchardyne and Queen Eglantyne his Wyfe," was dedicated to her. In the stilted language of that time he says: "Unto the right noble puissant and excellent princess, my redoubted lady, my lady Margaret, Duchess[1] of Somerset, mother unto our natural and sovereign lord and most Christian King Henry the Seventh . . . I, William Caxton, his most indign humble subject and little servant, present this little book I late received in French from her good grace, and her commandment withal, for to reduce and translate it into our maternal and English tongue; which book I had long to fore sold to my said lady, and knew that the story of it was honest and joyful to all virtuous young noble gentlemen and women." He then goes on to make this quaint plea for the reading of romances: "For under correction, in my judgment, histories of noble feats and valiant acts of arms and war, which have been achieved in old time of many noble princes, lords and knights, are as well for to see and know their valiantness, . . . as it is to occupy the ken and study overmuch in books of contemplation." He concludes the dedication: "Beseeching my said lady's bounteous grace to receive this little book in grace of me her humble servant; and to pardon me of the rude and common English, where as shall be found fault; for I confess me not learned, ne in knowing the art of rhetorick, ne of such gay terms as now be said in these days and used. But I hope that it shall be understanden of the readers and hearers; and that shall suffice. Beseeching Almighty God to grant to her most noble good grace long life and the accomplishment of

[1] Either Caxton made a mistake in Lady Margaret's title or is calling her "Duchess" as a matter of courtesy.

her high noble and joyous desires in this present life; and after this short and transitory life everlasting life in heaven. Amen."

The Lady Margaret "greatly delighted" in the seven penitential psalms, and at her request Bishop Fisher published a treatise on them, which was printed by Pynson, the third of the early printers. Pynson also printed at the Countess' expense a revised copy of the Sarum Breviary. It was at her instance, too, that Henry Watson translated Brant's "Ship of Fools" from French into English and that Wynkyn de Worde printed it. Walter Hylton's "Ladder of Perfection" was a book much loved by the Countess of Richmond; she translated this herself and had it printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1484. An introductory verse says:

> This heavenly book, more precious than gold,
> Was lately directed with great humility,
> For godly pleasure therein to behold,
> Unto the right noble Margaret, as ye see,
> The King's mother, of excelent bounty,
> Harry the Seventh, that Jesu him preserve.
> This mighty Princess hath commanded me
> T' imprint this book, her grace for to deserve.

The author, addressing himself to the leisure class then arising in England, gives the most practical advice as to the union of the active and the contemplative life. He says: "By the one, thou shalt bring forth the fruit of many good deeds in help of thy Christian brethren; by the other, thou shalt become fair, clear sighted, and clean in the Supreme Brightness, which is God . . . Not neglecting thy children, thy servants, thy tenants and all thy Christian brethren, nor letting them decay nor perish for want of looking to. For thou must think that since God has put thee into that estate of life it is the very best for thee, and that thou canst not do better than in performing all that belongs to it in the very best manner, and with all the willingness and gladness of mind thou art able. This I say to thee, not as though thou didst it not, but that thou shouldest do it better, with more alacrity and cheerfulness by reason of my writing." Lady Margaret is said to have modeled her spiritual life largely on the "Ladder of Perfection." Certainly no one familiar with the works of charity and piety of her later years can doubt that she did indeed lead this twofold life with both "alacrity and cheerfulness." Some few copies of this work are still in existence, as also of "The Mirror of Gold," published in 1507. This has many woodcuts, some full-page ones, with ornamental borders; one cut has the royal arms, with Margaret's name flower, the daisy, arranged in groups of three. A singular representation of the Last Judgment shows our Saviour seated, with His hands raised; one angel with a trumpet calls the dead to arise, another plays on a violin, while in the centre four angels are carrying the blessed

to heaven in a large sheet. This book was very popular in its day.

The Countess of Richmond's literary work is praised for being free from "the prevailing fault of English diction in the fifteenth century, the affectation of Anglicizing Latin words." Her translation from the French of Gerson's "Imitation of Christ" was printed in 1503 by Wynkyn de Worde and was the first English edition of that immortal work; two manuscript copies, of about 1460, may be seen, one in Cambridge and the other in Trinity College, Dublin. An extract from the work will show how well it compares with the best English of to-day: "Lord, I come unto Thee, to the end that health may come unto me of Thy gift, and that I may joy at the holy feast that Thou hast made ready unto me, by Thy sweet benignity, in the which my Saviour is all that I may or ought to desire; for Thou art my health, my redemption, my strength, honor and joy. Alas! my Lord God, make the soul of Thy daily servant joyous, for, my Lord Jesus, I have raised my soul unto Thee, and now desire devoutly and reverently to receive Thee into my house, to the end that I may deserve with Zacheus to be blessed of Thee, and to be accounted among the children of Abraham. My soul desireth Thy body, my heart desireth to be united and onely with Thee; give Thyself unto me, good Lord, and then I suffice, for without Thee no consolation nor comfort is good; without Thee I may not be, and without Thy visitation I may not live."

Lady Margaret's contemporaries welcomed this version of the "Imitation" in the vernacular; the first edition was soon exhausted. Pynson brought out a second edition the same year and continued to print others.

Lady Margaret must have owned quite a library, judging by the standing of that time. Fisher says: "Right studious she was in books, which she had in great number, both in English and French." Her love of literature must have been well known, and no doubt many precious volumes were brought to her notice by friends and booksellers. Her mother-in-law, the Duchess of Buckingham, left her by will "a Book of English being a Legend of Saints, a Book of French called Lucum, another book of French of the Epistles and Gospels and a Primmer with clasps of silver gilt, covered with purple velvet." The "Primmer" was a prayer-book for the use of the laity. As books by reason of their great cost could be owned only by the nobles and the wealthy, many were beautifully gotten up for these patrons in imitation of illuminated manuscripts, and their covers were of costly materials, embellished with fine metal work, sometimes inlaid with gems.

But in her thirst for knowledge Lady Margaret by no means neglected the more usual accomplishments of the women of her day.

Some knowledge of medicine in a simple, practical way was certainly hers; we read of her tending the poor in person, dressing their wounds and curing their diseases. In needlework, too, she was skilled; some specimens of her embroidery were still to be seen in her early home at Bletsoe as late as the reign of James I. Some other handiwork—probably a kind of tapestry—is described as "a carpet with the arms and alliances of the family;" this is still in existence and much treasured by the owners.

In his anxiety to have his own claim to the throne recognized, Henry deferred his marriage until January, 1486. It was celebrated "with all possible religious and glorious magnificence at court and by the people with bonfires, dancings, songs and banquets." At the marriage procession "each partisan of the Lancastrian House gave his hand to a lady of the Yorkist party, she holding a bouquet (though the season was midwinter!) of the red and white roses combined." We do not read of the presence of the Countess of Richmond at the marriage, but doubtless she was there even if only as a looker-on from some sheltered place, leaving the public honors to the young Queen.

Margaret seems to have felt for her son's wife the affection of a mother. Some authorities say that she had been for a short period during the reign of Richard III. a sort of "lady governess" to the young Elizabeth; no doubt she then learned to love the "Lady Bessie," so renowned for her sweet and gentle disposition. The Countess was much at court during the early years of her son's reign; her influence seems to have been felt in encouraging a true spirit of religion as well as a taste for literature, which the gradual cessation of wars left the nobility more at leisure to cultivate. She appears to have displayed a marvelous tact in guiding the young Queen at the beginning of her career and yet keeping herself studiously in the background as far as political matters were concerned. Had she been ambitious, she might easily, through her son's grateful devotion and her own great strength of character, have made herself a power in the land. But such thoughts apparently never entered her mind. One likes to think of her at this period, between her early years of unrest and sorrow and her later ones of saintly devotion solely to God's service, as enjoying in a sweet and natural way the home life of the court, varied by the great functions that characterized the leading events of the reign. We read of her on the occasion of Henry's public entry into London as viewing the pageant in company with the Queen and the ladies of the court from a secluded place in Bishopsgate. The Queen's coronation, as we know, did not take place until some time after that of Henry, he being very sensitive about owing the throne in

any way to his wife. When the ceremony did take place, however, it was carried out with great pomp and magnificence. A day or two before, a water fête, a popular amusement of that time, took place on the Thames; a great number of boats, some filled with revelers, others with members of the court, passed on the river from Greenwich to the Tower. One striking feature of the pageant was an immense dragon breathing flames, in allusion to the King's Welsh ancestry, a fact to which he referred constantly during his reign. On the actual day of the coronation, the feast of St. Katherine, 1487, all the public honors were reserved for the Queen alone. The King, with his mother and the ladies in attendance upon her, watched the stately ceremony from a platform built high up between the pulpit and the high altar at Westminster, and screened from sight by lattice work and hangings of arms. At the state banquet in Westminster Hall in honor of the coronation the Countess looked on from a similar screened balcony. She heard Mass with the King in St. Stephen's chapel on the following morning, and later in the day, when Elizabeth "kept her estate" in the Parliament chamber, "my ladie the King's mother sat on her right hand." At Christmas time of the same year Lady Margaret came again to the court at Greenwich, where she made the customary gifts of money to the various officials; one account alludes to her giving twenty-six shillings and sixpence, a sum equal to about sixty-five dollars at the present time. Then the heralds announced the gift, "De hault puissant et excellent princesse la mer du roy notre souveraine countesse de Richmonde et de Derbye, largesse!"

During 1488 we read of Lady Margaret being at Windsor quite frequently; she seems to have celebrated the principal feasts with her son and the Queen. She is mentioned as assisting at the celebration of the feast of St. George, when she and Elizabeth wore similar robes of the Garter fashioned like those worn by the King and the knights. Much honor was paid her; "at the Te Deum she was censed next after the King and Queen and before the knights companions. On the Sunday following she and the Queen, arrayed in gowns of the livery of the order, rode to evensong in a splendid chair covered with rich cloth of gold and drawn by six horses trapped in the same manner and followed by a suite of twenty-one ladies clad in crimson velvet and riding upon white palfreys sumptuously ornamented."

At Christmas time, 1489, Lady Margaret was again with the royal family at Shene. At the Twelfth Night festivities she is described as wearing "a like mantell and surcoat as the queen with a rich corrownal on her head."

The King was most punctilious about etiquette, and on the birth of Prince Arthur deputed his mother to draw up regulations for

the ceremonious care of the young heir. Numerous governesses, nurses and other attendants were appointed, among them "three chambermaids called rockers." There were provided two cradles of "tree, fair set forth by painter's craft," the larger one being a state cradle, "decked with cloth of gold furred with ermine." The ceremonies to be observed at the christening of the royal infant were also very carefully planned. Two hundred tapers were to be borne before him and the baby prince was to have "a little taper to carry in its hand to the high altar." The Countess is not mentioned as being present at the baptism, though the Earl of Derby was one of the godfathers. Among other matters of etiquette delegated to the King's mother was that of reforming the mourning costume of the ladies of the court. Mourners had been in the habit of wearing a curious sort of chin cloth of linen. By the new ordinance of the Lady Margaret the exact position of this "barbe" was definitely fixed, to vary according to the rank of the lady wearing it. The size of the mantle and the length of the train were also regulated. It was permissible, for instance, for a countess to wear "a train before and another behind; the train before to be narrow, not exceeding the breadth of eight inches, and must be trussed up before under the girdle or borne upon the left arm." This quaint document can still be seen at the Heralds' College.

The Christmas season of 1489 seems to have been celebrated with a special display of the old-time English merrymaking. The court was then at Westminster, where they were enlivened by "an abbott of misrule that made much sport and did right well in his office." On Candlemas Day, High Mass was celebrated by the Bishop of Exeter, Richard Fox, who had at one time been chaplain and confessor to the Countess, and at which we are told Sir William Knevet carried her taper. At Whitehall, in the evening, the King and the Queen, with Lady Margaret and the court, "there had a play and after a voyde." The voyde was apparently light refreshments of "comfits"—sweetmeats with ginger and other spices—taken with ipocras or other sweet wines. The Countess also came to witness the ceremonies incident to the creation of Prince Henry as Duke of York, when, we are told, she wore her coronet and came immediately after the Queen. The Earl of Derby took part in this and many other of the great court functions. We read of the presence of the Countess at court again in November of the following year, when a daughter was born to the royal couple. The little princess was named Margaret in compliment to her grandmother, who was godmother as well and made a christening gift of a chest of silver gilt full of gold. The goldsmith's art was at its height in Tudor England, and the intrinsic value of such a chest, with its intricate

carving and decorations, would be great quite irrespective of its contents.

About the last great festivity at which we hear of the Countess was the marriage of the young Prince Arthur with Catherine of Arragon. This seems to have eclipsed in magnificence every other event celebrated in the reign of Henry VII. The Countess appears on this occasion to have stayed at the mansion given her by the King, called Cold Harbor, where she entertained many of the English and Spanish nobles. One of the chroniclers tells us "the place was right royal and pleasantly beseen . . . enhanged with rich cloths of Arras and in the hall a goodly cupboard made and erect with great plenty of plate both silver and gilt and they were set at the board encompanied and coupled every of them, as well the men as the women, with his companion of England to make them cheer and solace." It is to be hoped these "companions" were able to converse with each other through the medium of a common language, otherwise one fears that they could have given each other but little "cheer and solace" after all. But we are assured that "there were dainties and delicacies with divers wines abundant and plenteously," so no doubt the feast was merry enough. During the festivities, which lasted for nearly a week, there were many jousts and banquets, at some of which the Countess was undoubtedly present. She is specially mentioned as being at a banquet in the Parliament chamber, and again on the same evening in Westminster Hall at "an interlude and a disguising with dances," or as we should say, a masquerade. In November the court went by water to Richmond in great state; the Earl of Derby had his barge and the Countess another, "right goodly covered, painted and beseen." The street pageants, from London Bridge to St. Paul's Churchyard, were wonderful, indeed. Some may be disposed to blame a lady of the Countess of Richmond's recognized piety for taking part in such gorgeous displays; but we must remember that one so closely allied to royalty could not very well dispense with its outward show, more particularly at that period, when the "boast of heraldry and pomp of power" were so lavishly displayed. As time went on, however, she stayed at the court less frequently; in her more retired life at her various manors she gradually came to devote more and more of her time to prayer and good works for her dependents and humble neighbors. At Torrington, in Devonshire where she sometimes stayed, "pitying the long path the pastor had from home to church, she gave to him and his successors the manor-house there, with lands thereunto." At Sandford Peverell, another house of hers in the same county, an aisle in the church was said to have been built by her; her arms and those of the Earl of Derby are still to be seen

there. At Durham the church was probably benefited by her bounty, for her statue and coronets ornament the battlements; this would scarcely be the case had she not been a benefactor.

About the year 1497 Lady Margaret, with her husband's permission, renewed a vow of chastity that she had made in her widowhood; about the same time she began that life of asceticism which lasted until her death; in accordance with a custom of the age, she wore a girdle of hair and practiced other austerities. Bishop Fisher, whose friendship and influence were to count for much good in her life, had become acquainted with her shortly before. He mentions in his accounts as proctor of Cambridge a visit to Greenwich in 1495, when he was presented to the King's mother. She was quick to perceive his great attainments and spirituality, and before long chose him as her chaplain and confessor. He gives us in his funeral sermon many details of her life of prayer and mortification; he says that she rose at five, and after private devotions said the Matins of Our Lady with one of her gentlewomen. It was quite a usual thing for English ladies of that day to recite these Matins. The Lady Margaret, however, did more; she was accustomed to say also the Matins of the day with her chaplain, after which she usually heard four or five Masses, continuing in prayer till dinner time, "which of the eating day was ten of the clock and upon the fasting day eleven.' After dinner followed stations to three altars daily, with evensong both of the day and of Our Lady, with other prayers, and just before she went to bed she spent "a large quarter of an hour" in her chapel. The same clear mind which had guided her in the great crises of her life must have enabled her to arrange the details of her daily duties with the least possible loss of time, for in spite of all these hours devoted to prayer, we find her being praised for the orderly management of her household. This was not a small task by any means when we realize that a lady of the rank of the Countess of Derby might number several hundred attendants of various degrees on her estate. The duties of hospitality and care of the poor were scrupulously observed and some time would still be left for reading.

The King showed his confidence in his mother's great abilities in many ways; among others he placed in her care (1485) the young sons of the Duke of Buckingham, to be brought up as became their rank. The Lady Margaret had charge of their property, which she must have managed most successfully, as the young Duke, when he attained his majority, was one of the richest nobles at a wealthy court. The Countess had the care at times of her grandsons and of her young stepbrothers, and she educated several other young men at her own expense. It is probable that some of these lived

in her house, as was the custom when great nobles became the patrons of promising youths. A letter is extant, written from Windsor, in which Lady Margaret asks the Chancellor of the University to send a Maurice Westbury to instruct "certain young gentlemen at her finding."

The King visited his mother at her manor of Colyweston, and later we heard of him as making a "progress" into Lancashire, there "to recreate his spirits and solace himself with his mother the Lady Margaret, wife to the Earl of Derby." The Queen accompanied him on this visit, and we hear of a sum of money being given "to the women that sang before the King and Queen." At other times we hear of her minstrels being paid for their services on great occasions. At one period of her life the Lady Margaret had a poet in her employ as well, all this being quite in accordance with the customs of the age. It is thought that Erasmus held this post for a while, though the records do not mention his name. The Countess was essentially a great lady and lived as such, but the ordering of her household and carrying out of the etiquette of her rank absorbed neither her thoughts nor her time. She entered heart and soul into the project which the Pope (in 1500) had in view of an alliance among Christian princes for a war against the Turks, and she is quoted as saying that "on condition that the princes of Christendom would combine themselves against the common enemy the Turks, she would willingly follow the host and help wash their clothes for the love of Jesu."

The Lady Margaret's translations and letters rank as part of the scanty literature of the fifteenth century. One of her less ceremonious letters brings to us from the more formal past a touch of pleasantry that appeals very humanly to our lighter spirits of to-day. It is written to Thomas Butler, Earl of Ormond, Chamberlain to the Queen, probably during his embassy to France, 1495 or 1496:

"My Lord Chamberlain, I thank you heartily that you list so soon remember me with my gloves, the which were right good, save they were too much for my hand. I think the ladies in that part be great ladies all, and according to their great estate they have great personages. As for news here I am sure you shall have more (seurte) than I can send you; blessed be God, the King, the Queen and all our sweet children be in good health. The Queen hath been a little crased,[2] but now she is well, God be thanked; her sickness is so good as I would, but I trust hastily it shall, with God's grace, whom I pray give you good speed in your great matters, and bring you well and soon home.

[2] In poor health.

"Written at Shene the XXV. day of April.

"M. RICHMOND.

"To my Lord the Queen's Chamberlain."

Lodge calls the following "the most polished specimen extant of the epistolary style of her time." She writes from Calais in 1501 to the King about recovering money that had been loaned to the Duke of Orleans while a prisoner in England:

"My dearest and only desired Joy in this world:

"With my most hearty Blessings and most humble commendations —I pray our Lord to reward and thank your Grace for that it hath pleased your Highness so kindly and lovingly to be content to write your letter of thanks to the French King, for my great matter, that so long hath in suit, as Master Welby hath shewed me your bounteous goodness is pleased. I wish my dear Heart, and my fortune be to recover it, I trust ye shall well perceive I shall deal towards you as a kind, loving Mother; and if I should never have it, yet your kind dealing is to me a thousand times more than all that Good I can recover and all the French King's might be mine withal. My dear Heart, and it may please your Highness to license Master Whitstongs for this time to present your honorable letters, and begin the process of my cause; for that he so well knoweth the matter, and also brought me the writings from the said French King, with his other letters to his Parliament at Paris; it should be greatly to my help, as I think, but all will I remit to your pleasure; and if I be too bold in this, or any of my Desires, I humbly beseech your Grace of pardon, and that your Highness take no displeasure.

"My good King, I have now sent a servant of mine into Kendall to receive such annuities as be yet hanging upon the account of Sir William Wall, my Lord's Chaplain, whom I have clearly discharged; and if it will please your Majesty's own heart, at your leisure to send me a Letter, and command me that I suffer none of my Tenants be retained with no man, but that they be kept for my Lord of York, your faire, sweet son, for whom they be most mete; it shall be a good excuse for me to my Lord and Husband; and then I may well and without displeasure cause them all to be sworn, the which shall not after be long undone. And, my sweet King, Felding this bearer hath prayed me to beseech you to be his good Lord in a matter he sueth for to the Bishop of Ely, now, as we hear, elect for a little office nigh to London. Verily, my King, he is a good and a wise well ruled Gentleman, and full truly hath served you well accompanied, as well at your first, as all other occasions; and that causeth us to be the more bold and gladder also to speak for him; howbeit my Lord Marquis hath been very low

to him in Times past, by cause he would not be retained with him; and truly, my good King, he helpeth me right well in such matters as I have business within thees parts. And, my dear Heart, I now beseech you of pardon of my long and tedious Writing, and pray Almighty God give you as long, good and prosperous life as ever had Prince, and as hearty blessings as I can ask of God.

"At Calais Town, this day of St. Anne's, that I did bring into this World my good and gracious Prince, King and only beloved Son. By

"Your humble Servant, Bede-woman and Mother,

"MARGARET R.[3]

"To the King's Grace."

A later letter on the same subject has come down to us, though in bad condition as the result of a fire:

"My own sweet and most dear King and all my worldly joy, in as humble manner as I can think I recommend me to your Grace, and most heartily beseech our Lord to bless you; and my good Heart, where that you say that the French King hath at this time given me courteous answer and written . . . letter of favor to his court of Parliament for the true expedition of my matter which so long hath hanged, . . . And, if it so might like your Grace, to do the same to the Cardinal, which as I understand is your faithful, true and loving servant I wiss my very joy, as I oft have shewed, and I fortune to get this or any part thereof, there shall neither be that or any good I have but it shall be yours, and at your commandmant as surely and with as good a will as any you have in your coffers, as would God you could know it as verily as I think it. But, my dear Heart, I will no more encumber your Grace with further writing in this matter, for I am sure your chaplain and servant Doctor Whitstone hath shewed your Highness the circumstance of the same. And if it so may please your Grace, I humbly beseech the same to give further credence also to this bearer. And our Lord give you as long good life, health and joy, as your most noble heart can desire, with as hearty blessings as our Lord hath given me power to give you.

"At Colyweston the 24th day of January, by your faithful true bede-woman, and humble mother, MARGARET R."

The Countess of Richmond was a very wealthy woman, being an extensive landowner in England and to a certain extent in Wales. At Holywell, in Flintshire, there is a small but lovely Gothic chapel built over St. Winifred's Well, said to have been the gift of the Countess; a carved stone can still be seen showing

[3] "R" standing for Richmond, not for a royal signature.

the profiles of the Earl and herself. As a landowner, Margaret performed many duties in connection with the administration of justice which seem somewhat strange to us to-day. At a dispute about boundaries which had existed for a long time between some of the inhabitants of Lincolnshire, a commission was appointed through her efforts as Lady of the Manor, and the final papers settling the matter are signed with her seal as well as those of the commissioners. It has been claimed that she was even a justice of the peace, a position certainly held by more than one woman in mediæval England. An instance is given of one who dispensed justice girt with the sword of state!

Truly, the Countess of Richmond and Derby was no weakling! That she could be severe when necessary, we can see by the following letter to the Mayor of Coventry:

"By the King's Mother.

"Trusty and well-beloved, we greet you well. And where we of late, upon the complaint of one Owen, Burgess of the city there, addressed our other letters unto you, and willed you by the same and in our name, to call upon you the parties comprised in the same complaint. And therefore to order the variance depending betwixt them according to good conscience. Albeit as it is said, the said Owen can or may have no reasonable answer of you in that behalf to our marvel. Wherefore we will and in the King's name command you efsoones to call before you the said parties and roundly to examine them. And thereupon to order and determine the premisses as may stand with good reason, and the equity of the King's laws. So as no complaint be made unto us hereafter in that behalf. Endeavoring you thus to do, as you tender the King's pleasure and ours, and the due ministration of Justice. Given under our signet at our manor of Colyweston the last day of September.

"To our trusty and well-beloved, the Mayor of the city of Coventry, and his brethren of the same, and to any of them."

Later in Lady Margaret's life, after she had begun her benefactions to the two great universities, her learning, judgment and inflexible spirit of justice were so well known that when a serious dispute arose between the town and the University of Cambridge, an appeal was made to her to help adjust the matter. Arbitrators were named at her suggestion, and both parties gave "bonds to abide by such award as might be made." The Lady Margaret was present at the examination, and her seal was affixed to the decision, which seems to have been most comprehensive: it contained thirty articles and provided for not only the immediate settlement, but for any disagreement that might arise in the future.

A letter from the University to the Countess of Richmond some time after her settlement of this dispute shows their appreciation of her efforts in their behalf:

"Pleaseth it your noble Grace, most excellent Princess, our special good lady and singular beenfactress. That forasmuch as not only heretofore ye have many and great benefits exhibited unto us, mercifully always condescending to our necessities, but also cease not daily by heaping benefits upon benefits, and adding bounteousness unto bounteousness to confer more and more upon us, your poor scholars, as witnesseth neither small nor few your gracious memorials here among us. Where also ye so generously tender the restfulness of us all that for the more quietous setting of ourselves to virtue and learning ye will us to appoint and certify your Grace of such articles in the composition between ourselves and the town as we think ourselves aggrieved with. According to the which your Gracious commandement we shall with all diligence apply ourselves, beseeching your Highness to see good direction and due reformation be made. We could not at this time contain, but to use our tongues and pens, to signify the vehemence of our joy . . . not causeless in us conceived of your generousness, and that when we have done what we can for your noble Grace by means of our powers or otherwise, yet shall we unfeignedly do much less than we are bound to do, as knoweth the blessed saints, whom we most humble beseech graciously to preserve you and everlastingly with the crown of most glory and joy to reward your goodness unto us ministered. Amen!"

The Countess of Richmond had long been a benefactress of many religious houses, as well as an associate in some. While quite young she was admitted with her mother into the fraternity of the abbey of Croyland, while at various times later on she became affiliated to three or four others. In accordance with that Christian spirit of democracy that prevailed in mediæval England, she became a member, in Stanford, of the Guild of St. Katherine, to which she was admitted on the same day as a servant of hers, one Richard Cotimont. To a high mental and spiritual outlook she united a very practical mind. She made an attempt at draining the Great Fen, in Cambridgeshire; the attempt, while unsuccessful, showed her sense of the importance of such a work in the interests of public health and the proper development of the land. While living at her manor of Colyweston, in Northamptonshire, she made opportunities for the poor of the neighborhood to earn a living by working at the slate quarries on her estate. One of her charities is in existence to-day. When contributing to the endowment of the magnificent Lady Chapel that her son added to Westminster

Abbey, she also set aside funds to provide for "alms and bread" to be given in the college hall every week to poor widows. She erected a chantry at Wimborne, where the souls of her parents were to be perpetually prayed for; and about the time that Henry began the construction of his chapel his mother had in view the increasing of the number of chantry monks and of preparing her own place of burial there. In the meantime her desire for the encouragement of sound learning led her to found readerships in divinity in both Oxford and Cambridge. These foundations bear the date of the feast of the Nativity of Our Lady, to which she had special devotion.

Lady Margaret seems always to have had a perfectly clear idea of what she wanted to accomplish. Her writings show that she had the amount of legal knowledge common to the great land-owners of the time, either men or women; we need not be surprised then at the minuteness with which the duties of the reader are set forth. Among them was the obligation of remembering the foundress whenever he said Mass. Some of the other regulations throw light on the university life of the time. The professor of divinity, as we should call him, was "to read in the divinity schools to every one, without fee or reward other than his salary, such works in divinity as the chancellor or vice chancellor with the college of doctors shall judge necessary for an hour . . . 7 to 8 A. M., or at such other time as the chancellor shall think fit." During Lent, with the sanction of the chancellor, the reading might be dispensed with, so that the reader himself or the clerics to whom he had been preaching might be free to preach to others outside of the university. Blessed John Fisher, venerated even then for his learning and holy life, was made the first reader at Cambridge; John Roper held a similar position at Oxford. Among the early successors of the Bishop at Cambridge was Erasmus, who had long been a friend of his and who had been residing for some years at the university, his room at Queen's College being still pointed out to visitors. Fisher, being a little later made doctor of divinity and vice chancellor of the university, was obliged to give up the readership. Realizing the great need at this time of regular preaching to the laity, he probably suggested to the Countess another means of furthering the good work they both had at heart, and so a preachership "to the praise and honor of the Holy Name of Jesus and the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary" was founded. This "preacher was to be a perpetual fellow of some college in Cambridge," and it was incumbent upon him to preach at least once in two years at St. Paul's Cross or at St. Margaret's, Westminster, and also at various places specified outside of London.

By this means many places remote from the capital had the opportunity of hearing occasional sermons from men well qualified for the task, and at the same time encouragement was given to the practice of preaching, which had fallen somewhat into decay. These preachers, with the younger clergy being trained at both universities, brought in vogue a simpler style of preaching which was more suited to rural parishes and was no doubt of incalculable benefit. Under the direction of Dr. Fisher, Lady Margaret had come to believe that it would be a better work to increase the opportunities for learning at the university than to found the chantry she had proposed at Westminster. She accordingly applied to the King, begging him to change the license he had already granted for that purpose into one for the foundation of a college at Cambridge. Cambridge rather than Oxford would naturally attract the bounty of the Countess, as it had long been connected with her family, many prominent members, notably Cardinal Beaufort, her great-uncle, having studied there, and her saintly confessor's interest in its advancement would, of course, be an important factor in her choice. The King replied to his mother in the following letter:

"Madam, my most entirely well-beloved lady and mother, I recommend me unto you in the most humble and lowly wise that I can, beseeching you of your daily and continual blessings. By your confessor, the bearer, I have received your good and most loving writing, and by the same have heard at good leisure such evidence as he would show unto me on your behalf and thereupon have sped him in every behalf without delay, according to your noble petition and desire, which resteth in two principal points: the one for a general pardon for all manners and causes; the other is for to alter and change part of a license, which I had given unto you before, for to be put into mortmain at Westminster, and of Cambridge, for your soul's health, etc. All which things, according to your desire and pleasure, I have with all my heart and goodwill given and granted unto you. And, Madam, not only in this, but in all other things that I may know should be to your honor and pleasure and weal of your soul, I shall be as glad to please you as your heart can desire it. And I know well that I am as much bounden so to do as any creature living, for the great and singular motherly love and affection that it hath pleased you at all times to bear towards me. Wherefore, mine own most loving mother, in my most hearty manner I thank you, beseeching you of your good continuance in the same. And Madam, your said confessor hath, moreover, shown unto me on your behalf that you of your goodness and kind disposition have given and granted unto me such

title and interest as ye have or ought to have in such debts and duties which are owing and due unto you in France by the French King and others, wherefore, Madam, in my most hearty and humble wise I thank you. Howbeit, I verily (think) it will be right hard to recover it without it be driven by compulsion and force, rather than by any true justice, which is not yet as we think any convenient time to be put in execution. Nevertheless, it hath pleased you to give us a good interest and means if they will not conform them to reason and good justice to diffend or offend at a convenient time when the case shall so require hereafter. For such a chance may fall that this your grant might stand in great stead for a recovery of our right, and to make us free, whereas we be now bound, etc., etc. And verily, Madam, an I might recover it at this time or any other, Ye may be sure ye should have your pleasure therein, as I and all that God has given me is and shall ever (be) at your will and commandment, as I have instructed Master Fisher more largely herein, as I doubt not but he will declare unto you. And I beseech you to send me your mind and pleasure in the same, which I shall be full glad to follow with God's grace, which send and give unto you the full accomplishment of all your noble and virtuous desires.

"Written at Greenwich, the 17th day of July (1504), with the hand of your most humble and loving son, H. R.

"After the writing of this letter your confessor delivered unto me such letters and writings obligatory of your duties in France which it hath pleased you to send unto me, which I have received by an indenture of every parcel of the same. Wherefore eftsoons in my most humble wise I thank you, and I purpose hereafter, at better leisure, to know your mind and pleasure further therein. Madam, I have encumbered you now with this my long writing, but me thinks that I can do no less, considering that it is so seldom that I do write, wherefore I beseech you to pardon me, for verily, Madam, my sight is nothing so perfect as it has been; and I know well it will appear (impair) daily; wherefore I trust that you will not be displeased though I write not so often with mine own hand, for on my faith I have been three days or I could make an end of this Letter.

"To my Lady."

One other letter of the King's to his mother is valuable as showing the delicacy of sentiment that prompted him to offer a bishopric to her confessor—whom all the world knew to be worthy of the high honor—without waiting for her to plead his cause:

"Madam, An I thought I should not offend you, which I will never do willingly, I am well minded to promote Master Fisher,

you confessor, to a bishoprick; and I assure you, Madam, for none other cause, but for the great and singular virtue that I know and see in him, as well in cunning[4] and natural wisdom, and especially for his good and virtuous living and conversation. And, by the promotion of such a man, I know well it should courage many others to live virtuously, and to take such ways as he doth, which should be a good example to many others hereafter. Howbeit without your pleasure known I will not move him, nor tempt him therein. And therefore, I beseech you that I may know your mind and pleasure in that behalf, which shall be followed as much as God will give me grace. I have in my days promoted many a man unadvisedly, and I would now make some recompension to promote some Good and virtuous men, which I doubt not should best please God, who ever preserve you in good health and long life."

King Henry always took great pains to let it be known that he promoted Dr. Fiher to a bishopric without any suggestion from his mother. Speaking of the matter afterwards, he said:

"Indeed, the modesty of the man, together with my mother's silence, spoke in his behalf." Bishop Fisher corroborates this in a letter written to Bishop Fox, of Winchester, many years after the Countess' death. In alluding to King Henry's bestowal on him of the See of Rochester, calling himself an "unworthy occupant," he goes on to say:

"There are many who believe that his mother, the Countess of Richmond and Derby, that noble and incomparable lady, dear to me by so many titles, obtained the bishopric for me by her prayers to her son. But the facts are entirely different, as your Lordship knows well, who was the King's most intimate counsellor, as you were also of the most illustrious King Henry VIII., who now by right of succession fills his father's throne, as long as your health allowed you to frequent the court. I do not say this to diminish my debt of gratitude to this most excellent lady. My debts are indeed great. Were there no other beside the great and sincere love she bore me above others, as I know for a certainty, yet what favor could equal such love on the part of such a Princess? But besides her love, she was most munificent towards me. For though she conferred on me no ecclesiastical benefice, she had the desire, if it could be done to enrich me, which she proved not by words only, but by deeds; among other instances, when she was about to leave the world. However, as I have spoken her praises in a funeral oration, I will not pursue the subject here, though she never could be praised too much. This only will I add, that though she

[4] That is, talent.

chose me as her director, to hear her confessions and guide her life, yet I gladly confess that I learnt more from her great virtue than I ever taught her."

The Countess was considerably older than the Bishop, who always reverenced her as a mother and always wished her to be prayed for at Masses that were said for him.

In 1504 the Earl of Derby died. He seems never to have lost King Henry's favor, even after the treason of his brother, Sir William Stanley. In his will he desired that "his lady should peaceably enjoy all the lordships, manors, etc., assigned for her jointure." He was buried in the priory church of Bourscough, and effigies of himself and his two wives adorn his tomb.

It was the following year that the Countess began the great work by which she is best known—the building of her colleges in Cambridge. A small institution known as "God's House" had been started by Henry VI., but his designs had never been fully carried out. It was suggested by Bishop Fisher that Lady Margaret should build her college on this site. This she accordingly did, having a special pleasure in feeling that she was in any way carrying out the plans of the saintly king, for whom she had great reverence and to whom she considered herself much indebted for many benefits received during the lifetime of her first husband. While, of course, many changes have been made in the buildings in the course of four hundred years, the Master's lodge, with its beautiful oriel, and the gateway, with the statue and armorial bearings of the Countess, still remain as she designed them. The beautiful dining hall shows in excellent condition the lovely oak screen with Lady Margaret's initials supported by the antelopes of the Beauforts. This is varied by a centre design commemorative of Henry VI., showing a crowned "H," and a quaint representation of God's House, having the symbolic Eye of God above it. A portrait over the high table represents the foundress standing, holding a book in her hand, while one of the lights in the stained glass window repreents her with the statues of the college. The light at the left shows Blessed John Fisher in his Cardinal's robes, which, however, he never wore in life, Henry VIII. having carried out his grim jest in frightful earnest. But though the Bishop was never allowed to receive his Cardinal's hat, the martyr's crown which the King's vengeance dealt out to him has proved, even in an earthly sense, a far greater honor.

As a recent writer on Cambridge says of the co-founders, "both joined to the spirit of piety an abounding appreciation of the spirit of knowledge." Lady Margaret worked intelligently and sympathetically with the Bishop in the task of compiling the statutes

for the new college. From the very beginning of her foundation she gave it the fullest measure of personal interest, introducing new features and impressing her personality upon it to an unusual degree. It is noteworthy that at Christ's College for the first time in any university literature, as well as theology, was to be studied. This was probably due to the influence of Erasmus, who was in residence at Cambridge at this time, laboring for the introduction of the "New Learning." Bishop Fisher was a friend and patron of Erasmus, and doubtless introduced him to the Countess. In Lady Margaret's statutes it was directed that at least half of the fellows should be natives of the Northern counties. Fisher was a native of York and the Countess had an undying affection for everything connected with the husband of her youth; she was especially interested in Richmond, Yorkshire, "from which place we take our title," which title, by the way, she always used even after that of Derby became her own. She seems to have thought of everything that could add to the efficiency of her college; one of her biographers remarks on the fact of her regulations being "singularly well adapted for guarding against perfunctory discharge of duties." The salaries allowed to the readers were very liberal for those days. In fact, until Lady Margaret founded her chair of divinity in 1502 the lecturers were not paid for that work at all. Lady Margaret had a great desire to help those who showed aptitude for learning, but had not the means to come up to the university to study; in her statutes she decreed that poor scholars should *always* be given the preference. She was the only non-resident founder to have rooms set apart for her use at her college. When not occupied by the Countess herself, they were to be at the disposal of Bishop Fisher. She did make use of them more than once, coming to Cambridge to oversee the progress of building, and again in 1506, when the work was done and the King came up with his mother to see the new buildings. A story is told about her when she was staying at the college after it had been opened; she saw a student about to be punished for some breach of discipline. Looking down from her window, she called, "Lente, lente (gently, gently), accounting it better to mitigate his punishment than procure his pardon." The story fully accords with one's idea of her character, combining as it did a strong sense of justice with womanly sympathy.

The noble foundress supplied her college liberally with everything needed for its successful maintenance; the beautiful gold plate for use in the dining hall is still exhibited with pride on days of ceremony. To the library she left a collection of books, principally in Latin and on theology. An instance of her womanly

thoughtfulness is shown in her arranging for a house not far from the town to be fitted up as a residence for the students of Christ's when there might be any epidemic at the university. One regulation of the new college gives us some idea of social life in the university in the early sixteenth century. It was especially forbidden to the fellows to keep "dogs or rapacious birds in the college or to play at dice or cards, except in the hall at Christmas for recreation."

Lady Margaret, who has been called by one of her modern biographers "the greatest benefactress Cambridge has ever known," did not feel that she had done enough in giving one college to Cambridge. After consultation with her friend, Bishop Fisher, she decided on getting the King's license to close St. John's Hospital, a sort of almshouse, which had then very few inmates, and converting it into a college for seculars. Unfortunately, she did not live to see her plans carried out; that work devolved on the saintly Fisher, who worked hard against great difficulties to fulfill his task of executor. The greatest difficulty he had to contend against was the unwillingness of the young King, Henry VIII., to give up some of his prospective inheritance to the new college. As a matter of fact, only a portion of his grandmother's bequest could be secured for this purpose, though Bishop Fisher made up as much as he could out of his personal means, which were small, for his diocese was a poor one and he was a generous benefactor to the needy. Some years elapsed, then, after Lady Margaret's death before the college was finally opened. In the meantime the remaining brethren of St. John's were taken care of and their pensions regularly paid.

Lady Margaret's faithful friend and executor made generous provision for her to be remembered in the Masses and prayers to be offered in the new chapel of St. John's, as well as for memorials of a more material kind. While the Plantagenet rose, the Tudor portcullis and the Beaufort antelopes adorn both of Lady Margaret's colleges, St. John's bears in addition her crest, a demi-eagle rising out of a crown. The stately gate-tower has as its central figure the patron of the institution, St. John the Evangelist. A statue at the entrance to the modern chapel represents the foundress holding a model of her building in her hand, while she stands upon a symbolical figure of Ignorance; she is faced by a statute of her co-worker, the Bishop, trampling upon Vice. Several portraits of both the Lady Margaret and of Bishop Fisher adorn the college, and the arms of both are repeated on the ceiling of the chapel and in the great oriel window. Her portrait hangs over the high table to-day; most of her portraits appear to have

been painted after her death, which may account for the rather stiff, austere look that characterizes them. They represent her "garbed like a nun," as widows frequently dressed, either standing with a book in her hands or kneeling at her priedieu. Some show across the background her motto, "Souvent me souvient" (Often I bethink me). This motto appears also over the gateway leading to the gardens at Christ's College.

In the meantime, in April, 1509, King Henry died in his palace at Richmond, and was buried in his magnificent chapel at Westminster. The funeral sermon, which was afterwards published by Wynkyn de Worde at the request of Lady Margaret, was preached by Bishop Fisher at St. Paul's, where the body rested before being taken to Westminster. In his will the King named his "dearest and most entirely beloved mother, Margaret, Countesse of Richemount," as one of his executors. One of her first cares was to try to guide in some way her grandson of eighteen, whose education she had at one time superintended. The youthful Henry followed her advice in the matter of choosing his first privy council, but it is impossible to tell how great her influence might have been in his later life, for Lady Margaret did not long survive her son, dying in June of the same year at Westminster. Bishop Fisher speaks of her patience in her last illness and of her devout reception of the last sacraments, "and so soon after that she was anneled, she departed and yielded up her spirit into the hands of our Lord." She was buried in the aisle of her son's chapel, by the side of him who had always been as she loved to call him "her dearest earthly joy," and in whose interests she had spent the fullest energies of a vigorous mind and a commanding personality.

Erasmus, who had always been a great admirer of the Countess and an ardent sympathizer with her in her support of literature, was chosen to write her epitaph. It is a brief summary of what she accomplished for religion and education:

"To Margaret of Richmond, the mother of Henry VII. and grandmother of Henry VIII., who founded salaries for three Monks in this Convent, for a grammar school at Wymborn, and a preacher of God's Word throughout England; as also for two divinity lecturers, one at Oxford, the other at Cambridge; in which last place she likewise built two Colleges, in honor of Christ and His Disciple St. John. She died in the year of our Lord 1509, June 29." The poet Skelton, who had been Vicar of Trumpington, near Cambridge, and was conversant at first hand with Lady Margaret's great works there, wrote an elegy in the fashion of the time.

"AN ELEGY

"Upon the funeral of the most serene Princess and Lady, the Lady Margaret, late Countess of Derby, mother to the most puissant King Henry the Seventh: By Skelton, the King's poet laureat, the sixteenth day of August, in the year of our salvation 1516.

"Inspire my elegy, ye sacred nine,
For pious Margaret mix your tears with mine.
Within this pile a King's fam'd mother lies;
Henry, who in yon stately edifice
In splendor lives with many a noble Peer,
'Tis his grandparent lies inhumed here.
Queen Tanaquil's exalted mind and birth
(Whom Livy's pen extols 'bove all on earth),
Falls short of Marg'ret's; ev'n Penelope
Was less renowned for chastity than she:
Prudent as Abigail, King David's wife;
As Hester bold, in hazarding her life
To plead her people's cause; resembling three
The noblest Princesses in history.
Reader, I pray, whoe'er thou art, thy tears
For such a Princess offer and thy pray'rs.
. . . . . .
He that defaces, spoils, or takes away
This script, may Satan snatch him as his prey
Forthwith, and on him all his rage display.
Thou great illustrious ruler of the sky,
Who mad'st the world and reign'st eternally;
Gracious admit this Princess to thy throne,
Renown'd for sev'ral virtues, like thy own."

Her tomb of black marble was, like her son's, the work of the great Florentine sculptor, Torrigiano. The recumbent effigy in gilt bronze is considered one of the most beautiful in Westminster Abbey; it represents her in old age in her widow's nunlike garb, and with her hands characteristically clasped in prayer—those "merciful and liberal hands," as Bishop Fisher calls them, so constantly used in giving alms to the poor and needy. An iron railing originally enclosed the tomb; to this Skelton's elegiac verses were attached, but in spite of their concluding prayer, they were taken away during some of the troublous times the Abbey has passed through.

The Countess of Richmond's funeral sermon was preached by her lifelong friend and confessor, Bishop Fisher. From it we gain some idea of her good works, though, as another biographer says, the "notable acts and charitable deeds all her life exercised cannot in a small volume be expressed." The Bishop says of her: "Of marvelous gentleness, she was unto all folks, but especially unto her own whom she trusted and loved right tenderly . . . not forgetful of any kindness or service done to her . . ." She was "of singular wisdom, far passing the common rate of women." . . . "She was bounteous to every person of her knowledge or acquaintance. She was also of singular easiness to be spoken to, and full courteous answer she would make to all that came unto

her. . . . Unkind she would not be unto no creature, nor forgetful of any kindness or service done to her before. . . . Merciful also and piteous she was unto such as were grieved or wrongfully troubled, and to them that were in poverty or sickness or any other misery. To God and to the Church full obedient and tractable, seeking His honor and pleasure." He speaks of her "temperance in meats and drinks," that she "kept fast days diligently and seriously, though not bound on account of age and weaknes," "was houseled full a dozen times a year," which was noticeable, as Holy Communion was not received so frequently at that time. Her hospitality he praised highly, and hospitality included then much more than the entertaining of one's friends. To a person in Lady Margaret's position it often meant receiving travelers who sought lodging for a night or longer, giving shelter, perhaps for a long time, to people of rank or others who had lost all their possessions through the horrors of civil war; housing those who had come with petitions to the King or to have justice done by the Countess herself in her capacity of Lady of the Manor. The Bishop testifies to this form of her activity in the following words: "She procured justice to be administered to suitors, paid learned men to plead their causes; she daily gave lodging, meat and drink and clothing to twelve poor people, in sickness tending them with her own hands" and burying them when they died. No wonder, the Bishop goes on to say, that "all England of her death hath cause of weeping; the poor creatures that were wont to receive her alms . . . the students of both the universities, to whom she was as a mother; all the learned men of England, to whom she was a very patroness; . . . all the noble men and women, to whom she was a mirror, an example of honor; all the common people of this realm, for whom she was in their causes a common mediatrix. . . ."

Bishop Fisher was not a courtier, and his praise must be accepted as a true account of this noble and good woman, more particularly when corroborated by that of her other biographers.

Lady Margaret's will is a wonderful document, giving the most explicit details as to everything he wished done after her death. After bequeathing her soul to "Almighty God and to Our Blessed Lady St. Mary the Virgin and to all the holy company in heaven," she directs that her body is to be buried in the chapel at Westminster, "now begun . . . by our most dear son." She specified all the churches and chapels where Masses were to be offered and prayers to be said, with the number of torches that were to be carried and the offerings that were to be made according to the custom among people of her rank. Her executors were directed

to pay off all her debts "in as goodly haste and brief time as they can," to keep together her household servants for a quarter of a year at least and to pay them their wages for a half year. In addition, those "that had long continued and done to her good service" were to receive part of her goods.

She established three perpetual daily Masses in the monastery of Wetminster; a perpetual chantry in the church of Wimburn, where her parents were buried, with "one perpetual priest to teach grammar freely to all them that will come thereunto perpetually while the world shall endure." All her plate, jewels, vestments and altar hangings, books, etc., not otherwies disposed of, are to be divided equally between the two colleges she founded; she also left to Christ's a number of books, most of which may still be seen in the library of the college. It is touching to see the Countess remembering in the midst of works of almost national importance a pensioner, "Margaret White, anchoress in the House of Nonnes, beside Stamford," and leaving lands to pay for her maintenance and for "an honest woman to attend upon her during her life." Bishop Fox, of Winchester, one of her executors, was to attend to the rewarding of the executors, also to arrange that the number of twelve poor men and women whom she had kept at her manor of Hatfield should be maintained, at her cost, during the remainder of their lives.

Many personal friends are remembered with legacies of plate or a precious book from her valuable collection. One book may seem to us a very insignificant gift from a person of her wealth, but we must remember that books, especially when beautifully bound and decorated with precious metals, as was often done, were really "worth more than their weight in gold." Allowing for the greater purchasing power of money at the end of the fifteenth century, the original cost of an artistic first edition of Caxton or Wynkyn de Worde might easily be several thousand dollars. Lady Margaret's bequest to her son the King, then, of four volumes bound in vellum possessed a high money value apart from their literary and artistic merit. She left him a book of diverse stories in French, "at the beginning the book of Genesis with pictures lymned," "a great volume of vellum covered with black velvet, which is the second volume of Froissart," and the siege of Troy in English; to her half-brother, John St. John, "The Canterbury Tales" in English, and to other friends copies of Gower in English and the Magna Charta in French.

A woman biographer of the nineteenth century calls Margaret Beaufort "the brightest ornament of her sex in the fifteenth century." She was indeed cast in a large mould and was great in all

the relations of life. Her greatness of soul she proved by the way she bore both adversity and prosperity; her greatness of mind has a lasting monument in her colleges at Cambridge; of her great warm heart and its power for friendship, let him who knew her best speak. Bishop Fisher says: "Every one that knew her loved her and everything she said or did became her." Catholics of our own time may well be proud of this great and good woman. Her life of strong Catholic faith and social work of a high order contains practical hints for women to-day and should be a source of inspiration even after the lapse of four centuries.

A. S. Bailey.

London, England.

SHAKESPEARE IN SPAIN.

IN order to avoid heresy, the intercourse between England and Spain was very slight during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This is the reason why nobody then in Spain heard about the author of "Hamlet" and "King Lear," and this explains the failure of Shakespeare to influence the great Castilian dramatic writers, though between him and Lope de Vega "there are points of resemblance which," as Mr. Ticknor remarks, "it is pleasant to trace and difficult to explain, as they and their schools undoubtedly had not the least influence on each other."[1]

What the Bostonian critic says about Lope, a contemporary of Shakespeare, a Spanish critic of so great authority as Menéndez y Pelayo says of Calderon, who lived long years afterwards. This famous writer of Spain, after pointing out the great likeness that is found between a passage of Calderon's "Tetrarca de Jerusalem" and Shakespeare's "Othello," assures us that the former "had no knowledge at all of Shakespeare, and perhaps he never heard his name, as was then the case with all the Spaniards in regard to English authors.[2] We could not say the same thing about the English in regard to the Spaniards, as some of them were acquainted with many writers of Spain, such as Guevara, translated from the French in 1522 by Lord Berners; Valdés, translated in 1638, and Cervantes' "Don Quixote," which was read in England soon after its first appearance in 1604. But these and other Spanish authors were not known by the English directly from Spain, but from Italy, the nation which was at that stage of English literature the dreamland of the English fancy.

---

1 "History of Spanish Literature," Vol. II., p. 453. New York, 1854.
2 "Calderon y su Teatro," p. 313. Madrid, 1881.

Spain during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was inaccessible to the English, notwithstanding the efforts that were made by many of them, chiefly Protestants, to enter the Peninsular Kingdom, which was then guarded "como a un Parayso terrenal, mediante el Cherubin del Santo Officio," as an earthly paradise by means of the Cherubin of the Holy Inquisition.[3] We can find in this the reason why Spain was prevented from sharing in the many shiploads of manuscripts that were sent by Henry VIII. and his successor, as waste paper, to foreign countries, and why she was withheld from the knowledge of our great poets of that age, Milton and Shakespeare. But this careful protection of the Inquisition had the advantage of preserving Spain from the revolt of Luther and of strengthening her fidelity to her glorious faith and to her God.

In the eighteenth century we find the first Spanish writers that knew of the Bard of Avon; some of them, notwithstanding the slavish ideas and uneclectic taste borrowed from France and spread throughout Spain, have given a rather good account of Shakespeare. Yet his great lovers in Spain are to be found in the nineteenth century, when the strong reaction against the French methods began to set in. One of the first Spaniards to speak to his countrymen about the author of "Macbeth" was Leandro Fernandez de Moratin (1760-1828), very well known as a playwright. After extensive travels through Europe, he spent a year in London, whither he went as a pensioner of the Spanish Government to study the English stage. In 1798 he published a prose translation of "Hamlet," "which offended his academic theories in every scene."[4] The French influence that mastered Leandro and his love for Molière, who was his ideal, and Racine, whom he considered superior to Shakespeare, led him into many misjudgments and misinterpretations. These have been brought forth by the Jesuit José Aicardo,[5] who remarks that many things which Moratin blames in the notes to his translation of Shakespeare he praises in the introduction to his own comedies. His "Hamlet" is faithful even in the details and better worked out than the Abate Clodera thought it to be. Moratin's opinion of the play is that of a "great work, interesting and tragic, fit to kindle any fancy and fill any audience with fear and trembling."[6] There is no doubt that if Moratin had not first fallen

[3] Francisco de Pisa in his "Descripción de Toledo," Book I., chap. 25. Much has been written about the English in Spain during the time of Henry VIII. and his successor. *Cfr.* Menéndez y Delayo, "Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles;" Dr. McCrie, "History of Reformation in Spain."

[4] Fitzmaurice-Kelly, "A History of Spanish Literature," p. 361. New York, 1910.

[5] "Razón y Fé," Vol. II., pp. 271-2.

[6] "Obras de D. Nicolás y Leandro de Moratín," Vol. II., pp. 556-7. "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles de Rivadeneira."

worshiper to the literary spirit of France, with its rigid adherence to classical models, he would, according to his talent, have given a rather good appreciation of Shakespeare, instead of deeming him "distinctly inferior to Racine; for such is the conclusion at which Moratin arrived in his critical estimate of the work with which he dealt."[7]

Many years before Leandro gave his version to the press the learned Jesuit, Esteban de Arteaga, who may be called the Spanish Lessing, no less for his sound judgment in all æsthetic matters than for his having been the first Spaniard to speak authoritatively to Spain of the great genius of Shakespeare, had made a study on the uncommon and unparalleled qualities of the great English master. In one of his works which deals with "Philosophical Researches on Ideal Beauty" he speaks in these terms of the poet of Avon: "His pen portrayed the feelings and genius of men with such vividness that one fancies that it is not allowed to human ability to go beyond. . . . His exuberance excites wonder, no less than the great variety of his portraits, which are never thrown into confusion; but one and all reveal a power of description which surpasses that of other poets, with this difference, however, that others add to their pen-pictures a great deal of imagination, while Shakespeare seems to be the translator of Nature, appointed by her to be the looking-glass where even her most indistinguishable movements can be seen."[8] Such is an estimate of one of the most learned men that appeared in Europe during the eighteenth century. He sums up his appreciation by affirming that Shakespeare is a great deal more original and copious than the French poets.

A friend of Arteaga was the famous Abate Juán Andrés, recognized as the founder of the "History of Literature," which he wrote and published at intervals from 1782 to 1799. It is, as Mr. Hallam says, "an extraordinary performance, embracing both ancient and modern literature in its full extent."[9] Andrés is very unfair in his judgment on English writers, as may be seen by his disparaging criticisms of Milton and Shakespeare. In criticizing Shakespeare he seems to follow, to a great extent, the opinions of Voltaire, as, for example, when he foolishly censures the great poet for the gravediggers in "Hamlet." After having quoted some praises be-

[7] Mr. J. D. Ford in his interesting paper on the "English Influence Upon Spanish Literature in the Early Part of the Nineteenth Century," published in the "Publications of the Modern Language Association of America," Vol. XVI., No. 3.

[8] Esteban de Arteaga, "Investigaciones filosóficas sobre la Belleza Ideal." Madrid, 1789. This book, slender in quantity, but excellent in quality, is for the poet and lover of poetry what Balmes' "Art of Thinking" is for the philosopher. Both books deserve wider recognition.

[9] "Introduction to the Literature of Europe." Preface.

stowed on Shakespeare by Jones, Sherlock and other English writers, Andrés makes the following statement: "I do not find in the works of Shakespeare that beauty so much boasted of, and even if it were in his works, I believe it would be better to pass it by than have to find it amidst so much trash. Let anybody read the passages so highly praised by Pope, and even the very sense of Antonio praised by Sherlock, and tell us freely whether the few pathetic and eloquent phrases there found can bear comparison with the constant strain of foolishness that deforms all the play."[10] He tells us that if we wish to know who Shakespeare is, we ought to read him in English, since the original is worse than the translations. It is hard to understand how so learned a man as Andrés could be guilty of such blundering comment. But when we understand that only a few privileged minds were sufficiently free from the corrupted taste of the French school to grasp the merits of the great English poet, we are not surprised to find the majority of his Spanish critics of the eighteenth century led far astray. Many of those are to be mentioned here before we reach the great modern Shakespearean devotees. One of the former is Joseph Marchena, a constant admirer of Voltaire and an advocate of his irreligious tenets. His opinion of Shakespeare was as erroneous as his judgment of the best Spanish writers. A man who says that Juan de Avila and Luis de Granada are "titires espirituales" affords us amusement rather than resentment when he characterizes the writings of Shakespeare as "a garbage heap of the most loathsome barbarity."[11] Marchena never knew Shakespeare in the original; his knowledge was drawn from the French versions of Ducis and Letourner, most incompetent to give an adequate account of the poet's merits.

In the footsteps of Marchena followed his contemporary, José de Cadalso y Vasquez (1741-1782).[12] He ridicules the turgid style of Racine's "Phedra" as well as "the atrocities that Shakespeare brought upon the English stage." Cadalso's criticism was challenged by his contemporary, Sempere y Guarinos, who quotes his words and shows their absurdity.[13]

No less absurd is the judgment of Dr. Manuel M. de Marmol, who, in a lecture given at Seville in 1833, speaks of Shakespeare as a dreamer might. "How many dramatic writers," he exclaims,

---

[10] "Dell' origine, progresso e stato attuale d'ogni letteratura," Vol. VI., p. 4. Venezia, 1788.

[11] These critical appreciations are taken from his "Lecciones" on literature.

[12] "Los Eruditos a la violeta," or "Fashionable Learning," was published in 1772.

[13] "Biblioteca de escritores del Reinado de Carlos III.," Vol. II., p. 23.

"are thought to be worth more, even among the English and by all the learned men of the world, than the prodigious author of 'Hamlet'" [sic!][14] Together with this writer, we may quote Gomez Hermosilla, who in his "Arte de Hablar" [an inadequate plagiarism of Blair's "Poetry and Rhetoric"] affirms that "with skill, but without proper instruction and rules, we may compose the sometimes sublime, but always monstrous plays of Shakespeare."[15]

Greater sagacity and learning was shown by Solis. In spite of his academic theories, he admired Shakespeare and translated both "Hamlet" and "Romeo and Juliet," not indeed from the original, but from the French of Laplace and Letourner. No wonder, then, Shakespeare, as the Spaniards knew him through Solis, is so changed and distorted that one who knew the original would be convinced they were not translations, but parodies. Yet such as they were, the reception given to them when performed on the Spanish stage was most favorable. His "Romeo and Juliet," translated into harmonious verse, appeared in 1829 at Barcelona.[16]

Eighteen years after Solis published his versions and had seen them performed on the stage with success, as we have already mentioned, another poet published a translation of Shakespeare's "Macbeth." This was Joseph Garcia de Villalta, a man of sound judgment and in possession of no little poetic ability. But the public of Madrid, who enjoyed and praised the insipid and even ridiculous French plays that were performed in the Teatro del Principe, evidenced their lack of appreciation by hissing the immortal drama of Shakespeare, so carefully translated by Villalta.[17]

Mariano José de Larra (1809-1837), though educated in France, never permitted his mind to be narrowed by French theories, but always admired the extraordinary genius of our great dramatic writer. Larra in one of his critical essays,[18] in which he declares that the genius of great men does not appear so much in their ability to say new things, but in saying and doing the common ones in an uncommon way, asks: "What is a lover but a being we find in every intrigue of love and one that has been put on the stage by hundreds of dramatists? But why is it that only *Othello*, only the lover of Shakespeare's play, has traversed the course of time and has been performed in all the theatres of the world?"

A friend of Larra and a constant admirer of Shakespeare was

[14] "Discurso pronunciado en la Academia de Buenas Letras de Sevilla," 1833.

[15] "Arte de Hablar," Vol. II., p. 264. Madrid, 1839.

[16] Menéndez y Pelayo, in his "Ideas Estéticas en España," and Fr. García Blanco, in his "Historia de la Liera tura Española en el siglo diez y nueve," give this account of Solís' works on Shakespeare.

[17] García Blanco, *op. cit.*, Vol. I., p. 251.

[18] In his criticism of Hartzenbusch's play, "Los Amantes de Teruel."

Donoso Cortés, one of the greatest orators that Europe heard during the last century. Speaking about the great Spanish poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, who commonly were not original, but imitators of the poets of Greece and Rome, he exclaims: "And in what century did that happen? In that century in which Tasso sings the praises of Bouillon and Tancredo, in which Shakespeare made the sword of Melpomene flash on the stage of England with a resplendence that will last as long as his name, as long as the world. In vain you will seek another author endowed with such profound knowledge of the human heart or a painter of such dreadful reality in the presentation of great characters: Shakespeare will be always the despair of those who dare to imitate him."[19] Donoso Cortés closes the first half of the last century, wherein so few worthy appreciations of our great poet are to be found. As we advance towards our own age the best Shakespeare critics of Spain begin to appear.

One of those is Pedro Antonio de Alarcón (1833-1891), who as a poet and prose writer ranks among the best authors that Spain possessed in modern times. Alarcón in a sane lecture on morality in artistic matters speaks thus of the English tragedian: "Nobody denies that giant to be the greatest dramatic writer of the universe. And what was he in purity? An artist that only cared for exterior form? A mechanical worker whose only employment is to unite one lively painting to another, subverting all truth and regarding only the effect to be produced and the cries of terror to be brought forth from the listeners? . . . Ah, no! His genius is based on better ground. His plays are the mirror of life and the autopsy of the conscience. When *Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, Gloucester* move or act, the spectator thinks that he approaches the abysses of the soul and sees there the first springs of the passions, the hidden fountains of the good and evil, the cavern where crime is generated, the unknown lake where the tears unite, the strong rock where virtue crystallizes, the boiling lava that makes the earth tremble. . . . Every wish and every passion, every act of heroism and every fault has at its side an angel or a devil, its reward or its punishment. The sting of conscience is the horrible Fury which the author unchains against the guilty. God, full of mercy, is always in the play, consoling the just with the peace of conscience. This is why Shakespeare's plays are so pleasant and so edifying in the midst of their terrors. Heaven is the end of all. There *Desdemona,* the innocent victim of the *Moor,* triumphs; there is *Antonio,* the debtor of the Jew; there the lovers of Venice; there

[19] "Obras de Donoso Cortés," Vol. I., p. 23. Madrid, 1854.
[20] "Discurso de recepción en la Academia," pp. 36-37. Madrid, 1877.

Ophelia; there the sons of Edward; there *King Lear,* a second Laocoon, tormented not by serpents, but by his unfaithful daughters."[20] Alarcón was indeed a great lover of Shakespeare. His criticism shows a fine intelligence of Shakespeare's genius, a vast konwledge of the plays and a keen, judicious appreciation of all their beauties.

It seems that Alarcón imparted this same love and knowledge of Shakespeare to his friend, Manuél Tamayo y Baus (1828-1898), the greatest Spanish dramatic writer of modern times. His plays, "Lances de Honor," "Los Hombres de bién" and "Un Drama Nuevo," are masterpieces. In this last, which is "the most ambitious and unquestionably the best of his plays,"[21] he introduces Shakespeare as one of the *dramatis personæ,* and he plays his rôle so admirably and his part is so rich in dramatic creation that Shakespeare himself would undoubtedly class it with his own "Macbeth" and "King Lear." The beginning of "Un Drama Nuevo" is as follows:

(House of Yorick. Shakespeare with manuscript in his hand enters front door. Yorick accompanies him.)
Shakespeare. Tell me—why have you brought me to your house?
Yorick. Perhaps you'd prefer not to have come?
Sh. By no means. You know I deem your invitation a favor.
Yor. Then why are you so eager to leave?
Sh. I left the company of many illustrious persons to answer your summons, and it would be discourteous of me to keep them waiting over long, since they have come from afar to hold converse with me.
Yor. Your guests shall be appeased by some Spanish wine which I will send without delay. Tell them that this wine has power to raise the dead to life. And will it not be a wonderful sight to behold the dead monarchs of England raised to life in one assemblage, and each one disputing his rival's claim to the throne? But can they be brought to life more certainly than some of them have been already by your pen?
Sh. But, come now, tell me, what is it you wish?
Yor. What more can I wish than to glory in my joy of having in my house the remarkable poet, the great Shakespeare, the glory and boast of England?

Tamayo in one of his literary lectures declares that the creation of the modern stage "was the enterprise of the two great priests of our Spain and of the most mighty Shakespeare, three geniuses endowed with so great imaginative powers, such sensitive hearts and such lofty spirits that it seems they were born only for that purpose."[22] Mr. Boris de Tannenberg in his book, "L'Espagne Littéraire," declares that perhaps Tamayo's love for Shakespeare passed beyond due bounds.

Tamayo Baus has had the fortune of a good biographer, Sr. Siscars y Salvadó, who has written the life of his friend with affectionate interest and biographic tact, a combination rarely displayed in the written lives of men of letters. Siscars y Salvadó, in speaking of Tamayo's love towards Shakespeare, shows us in a

21 Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *op. cit.,* p. 376.

22 "Discurso de recepción en la Real Academia de la Lengua." Edición de la Academia, Vol. II., p. 275.

simple, unaffected way his own admiration for our great English playwright: "Tamayo had special skill in painting and sculpturing female characters. In this he resembles Shakespeare, Lope de Vega, Göethe, Garcia, Gutierrez and Bretón de los Herreros. The first was truly a great creator of characters. In that artistic gallery where we find *Hamlet, Othello, Romeo, Shylock, Iago* and many others, we find also *Ophelia, Desdemona, Juliet, Lady Macbeth,* all of them splendid creations of female persons."[23] Some pages further on he writes: "Very well does our poet [Tamayo] tell us that Shakespeare, the most universal, the most original and human of dramatic writers, has scarcely any play in which there is not some imitation of other authors, and sometimes his powerful genius takes the whole fact from the chronicles and puts it on the stage with accuracy of detail and vividness of portrayal."[24]

In the last period of the nineteenth century the Island of Mallorca gave to Spanish literature two men of great talent and vast erudition: Tomás Aguiló and José Maria Quadrado. Both of them were great admirers of Shakespeare. Aguiló always held in high esteem three great poets of England: Milton, whom he imitated in his "Abdiél y los Siglos ante Jesucristo;" Byron, whose Hebrew melodies he translated; and Shakespeare, whose plays he used to read constantly and with that feeling of veneration which one is conscious of when conversing with great men. His "Articulos Literarios"[25] and, in fact, all his writings show evidences of this veneration of poet for poet. Quadrado shared this veneration, and he translated, or, more properly speaking, imitated, Shakespeare's "Macbeth," "King Lear" and "Measure for Measure," and these plays he published under the same titles, declaring that he only wanted to cast them in a new form. They are dramatic; they show much labor and careful work, but generally they are but poor counterparts of the genius of the original. Menéndez y Pelayo has given a good appreciation of what he styles "refundiciones" of Quadrado.[26]

With Quadrado and Aguiló we may mention D. Manuel Milá y Fontanals, who in his study on Calderon's "Principe Constante" and in his unrivaled book on "Æsthetics" has given a brief but clever appreciation of Shakespeare's genius. From the "Æsthetics" we quote the following:[27]

---

[23] "Tamayo y Baús," p. 105.

[24] *Ibid,* p. 120.

[25] "Obras completas de D. Tomas Aguiló," Vol. VI., 1883.

[26] "Estudios de Crítica literaria," Vol. V., p. 69.

[27] "Tratado de Estética," p. 252. Barcelona, 1888. Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly in his bigoted "History of Spanish Literature" overlooks this great writer of Spain, as well as many others of high merit, such as Amos Escalante, V. Querol, C. Nocedal, R. Nocedal, Navarro Villoslada, Ortí y Lara and Juan Mir y Noguera, one of the most learned and prolific writers of modern Spain.

"In spite of the manifold irregularities of his diction and of the very evident inequalities of his genius shown now by the work of a master mind, now alternating to that of a mediocre dramatist, nobody has surpassed Shakespeare in richness and power of imagination; nobody has set forth with more profound knowledge, more certainty and more poetic attractiveness the mysteries of the human heart. This is not to say that the reading of his work is always profitable and edifying; for Shakespeare's dramas extend over the whole range of human action, and his world of life embraces everything from the most low and vulgar to the highest and noblest." As we might expect Mila would not confine his opinion on the morality of Shakespeare to a written book, but we have been assured by some of his own pupils that he constantly insisted on this point.

Finally, in the last part of the nineteenth century several good translations of Shakespeare, together with some studies on his works, found favor throughout Spain.

The best poetic translation is that of Macpherson, a Spaniard of English descent, who published the works of Shakespeare, in several volumes. Macpherson's renditions are true, ingenious, and they constitute at present the best Spanish translation of Shakespeare's plays. A long and learned preface was published with Macpherson's version. Its author is D. Eduardo Benot, a writer well acquainted with English literature. Besides a biography full of the most minute details, Benot quotes the praises bestowed on Shakespeare by all the chief writers of England. His own appreciation of Shakespeare is given thus: "Shakespeare did not study the conventional literature of the classics in the English universities; but his inborn power of observation made of him the interpreter of Nature, the decipherer of the riddles of the heart. . . . His genius subdued all the powers of the passions; and in sculpturesque groups of incomparable beauty he presented them to the amazed world, that they might not only be the wonder of his own country, but also the charm and marvel of all ages."[28] Much of Benot's work bears a favorable comparison with the best parts of Coleridge's. Both writers have been instrumental in bringing to light many new thoughts, new ideas, new aspects, which even to the most diligent readers had formerly remained secret—beauties hidden by beauties.

Another translation of Shakespeare was made by D. Jaime Clark and published with a preface written by D. Juan Valera (1822-1905). Some good ideas may be gleaned from the many errors and ridiculous assertions contained in this preface.[29] Valera begins

[28] Preface, p. 154.

[29] Published also in his "Nuevos Estudios Criticos."

one of his paragraphs by asking: "What can I add to the praises bestowed upon Shakespeare, in Germany, by Wieland, the two Schegels, by Lessing and by many others who proclaim him to be the greatest of dramatic writers and the fountain-head from which the modern dramatists of Germany have derived their beautiful inspirations? How can I speak, how can I write about Shakespeare after the eulogy pronounced by Victor Hugo, a eulogy which is a gigantic monument, a series of huge dithyrambs, a colossal statue wrought in an imagination of fire with an enthusiasm that knows no limits, a statue afterwards smoothed and brightened by a diamond chisel? How can I dare to open my lips or permit my pen to go on after reading the beautiful apotheosis, the sublime greeting which Emerson sends Shakespeare from the other side of the Atlantic?" Notwithstanding all this, Valera deems Shakespeare inferior to Cervantes, to Lope de Vega and perhaps to Tirso de Molina; but he gives us to understand, however, that Shakespeare, ranked with such compeers, still remains very high in the opinion of the Spaniards; "as I put him, if not as high as Cervantes, on the same level with Calderon and near to Lope."[30] He finds that the characters of Cervantes are more original than those of Shakespeare. Not long afterwards he assures us that *Ophelia, Desdemona, Juliet, Miranda, Beatrice, Hero, Lady Macbeth, Othello* and *Hamlet* are kept in the mind of mankind with stronger firmness and consistency than the names of the most famous and renowned historical personages. . . . Shakespeare's heroes are stored with the elixir of eternal life and youth." In another work, speaking of Shakespeare's poetical qualities, Valera goes so far as to deny that true realism is to be found in his plays. "Nothing is more ideal, more remote from what happens every day, sometimes remote from the natural and possible, than what Shakespeare has written."[31] As a proof of what he says, he quotes an article of Vernon Lee (published many years ago in the *Contemporary Review,* where there are ideas which no student of Shakespeare will admit. Valera himself seems to profess the contrary when he writes: "The heroes of Shakespeare, some of Calderon, nearly all of Cervantes' and not a few other poets, have their proper individuality, they have a soul that belongs to them."[32] If the characters of Shakespeare's

[30] Valera, like many other Spaniards, has been too lavish in his praises of Cervantes. We admire the many good gifts of the author of Don Quixote, but even in the Spanish literature there are at least half a dozen writers of more genius, talent, richness of style and elocution than Cervantes. Not only Lope de Vega and Calderon, but Cabrera, Acosta, Granada, Nieremberg, the historian Coloma and the matchless Fr. Luis de León rank higher than the author of "Don Quixote."

[31] "Apuntes sobre el nuevo arte de escribir novelas; Obras completas," Vol. III., p. 202.

[32] "Estudios críticos," Vol. III., p. 104.

plays are so far removed from reality, so different from ordinary characters, how can they have a soul that belongs to them? This is the character of Valera's writings. He is in matters of criticism what D. Emilio Castelar was in history. It mattered little that he contradicted his statement of yesterday, provided that to-day's argument suited his purpose. His parallel between Lope de Vega and Shakespeare is as poetical as untrue:[33] "Beautiful and deep appears the Lake of Ginebra; but the lake is insignificant if I compare it with the greatness and unmeasurable depth of the wide ocean. So I think sometimes, and may God forgive my patriotic vanity if I fall into error, that Shakespeare is the lake and Lope de Vega the ocean, greater than the former in quality and quantity."

Many modern writers of Spain are to be mentioned among the Shakespeareans. The Jesuit José M. Aicardo, in many of his studies on Lope de Vega,[34] has shown his admiration for the great English playwright; so also Menéndez y Pidal in some of his works, chiefly in his excellent study on "El Condenado por Desconfiado" of Tirso de Molina. Sr. Josè de Echegaray is also an admirer and lover of Shakespeare.[35]

But Spain's greatest lover of Shakespeare is D. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo. He has not written any special work on the author of "Othello," but we may say that all his works contain expressions of love for him. He tells us that "the art of Shakespeare is admired and adored by all the nations of the world," and the reason is because "he uses the true language of nature amidst the passions."[36] Shakespeare "had pierced by intuition into the spirit of antiquity, describing, for instance, the Roman populace of the time of Julius Cæsar as neither the French tragedians nor Alfieri ever did, in spite of their having made a closer study of antiquity."[37] Menèndez quotes with pleasure the words of Lessing about one of Shakespeare's plays: "I know only one drama in which Love placed her hand, and that one is 'Romeo and Juliet.'" Of "Othello" he writes that "the jealousies of *Othello* are doubtless brutal and harsh in their origin and in their development; but that is the reason why they are thoroughly human . . . it is the passion such as it comes forth in any person who is truly passionate and adores a woman."[38] "Shakespeare's style is not a secure and unspotted

[33] "Ecos Argentinos," p. 328. Valera has written on Shakespeare in many other places, as in his "Discurso de recepción en la Real Academia," p. 329; "Estudios Críticos," Vol. III., p. 117.

[34] These studies, giving proof of profound admiration, have been published in the Spanish review, "Razón Fé," 1903, Vols. IV., V.

[35] "Discurso de recepción en la Real Academia," 20th of May, 1894.

[36] "Ideas Estéticas," Vol. V., pp. 162, 270, 289, 225.

[37] "Calderón y su Teatro," p. 187.

[38] *Ibid*, p. 328.

one, but his faults are not like those of Calderon. Shakespeare in the real tragic circumstances uses the most simple, most natural and unique expression that ought to be used then and there."[39] About the moral character of Shakespeare he writes that it is not exempt from blame, as happens likewise in the case of Lope de Vega; "nevertheless, both of them are the greatest dramatic writers that ever existed."[40] In regard to the English and Spanish stage, Menéndez y Pelayo is of the opinion that the Spanish is next to the English one in greatness and "superior to it in richness and national spirit."[41] His appreciation of the Spanish dramatic writers and of Shakespeare is given in these lines which he wrote many years ago: "Our writers very seldom showed that power of psychological observation, that deep intuition of the mysteries of the soul, that patient, detailed analysis of the secret powers which spur man to deeds of heroism or steep him in vice, that wonderful psychological faculty which united and combined with a power of imagination in no lower degree, places on so high a level the creations of Shakespeare."[42] Speaking of the imitations of Shakespeare made by Quadrado, he says that "they are a new manner of showing the love joined with veneration and astonishment which Quadrado, as all the great writers, have had towards that king of the stage whose genius seems to be presage of a future human race superior to the one we know."[43] Without doubt, Menéndez y Pelayo is the greatest Shakespearean scholar Spain has had. Besides his critiques, he translated, in excellent manner, many of Shakespeare's plays. His name heads the glorious series where Arteaga, Donoso Cortés, Alarcón, Quadrado, Tamayo y Baus and Benot are found. Much more could be cited from Menéndez, as nearly all his books afford us matter on this subject, but we may close the citations by applying to him the phrases which he himself has written about Hegel: "What beautiful pages on 'Macbeth' and 'Hamlet!' Only to the great it is permitted to understand and feel the great writers and thus express their admiration towards them."[44]

A word remains to be said about some Shakespearean students in Catalonia and of the South American republics. The chief of the Catalonian admirers of Shakespeare are Guimerá, who imitated him in some of his plays, and A. Masriera, who has translated with great felicity the best plays of Shakespeare into the Catalan lan-

---

[39] *Ibid*, p. 328.

[40] In a letter to Leopoldo Rius y Llosellas, "Crítica literaria," Vol. IV., p. 113.

[41] "Crítica literaria," Vol. IV., p. 117.

[42] El Alcalde de Zalamea in the "Obras completas de Lope de Vega."

[43] "Crítica literaria," Quadrado, p. 69.

[44] "Ideas Estéticas," Vol. IV., p. 327.

guage and has highly praised his admirable qualities.[45] Verdaguér, who is one of the greatest of Spanish poets, also admired Shakespeare, and indeed the lofty characters of his "Canigó" are Shakespearean.

In the literature of the South American republics the greatest lover and admirer of Shakespeare is the author of the "Tabaré," Sr. Zorrilla de San Martin; he has written a long article on the English playwright which does not fall far short of the best that have been written in the Spanish language. In Mexico we find Arango y Escandón; in Venezuela Andrés Bello; and in Chile Guillermo Junemann, all three Shakespeareans, chiefly the latter who has written a comprehenhive study of the English dramatist."[46] And in the Argentine Republic we name among others Ventura de la Vega, who imitated Shakespeare in his "Julio Cesar," as did Dr. David Peña in some of his plays.

This is not, on any count, a complete enumeration of the Shakespearean critics in South America, nor of the Spanish works, whether at home or abroad, which treat of Shakespeare. In a fuller list we would instance Luzán, Quintana, Martinez de la Rosa, who, by the way, came to change his ideas on dramatic literature after his study in the English dramatist;[47] Herrera Bustamente, Carlos Coello, Gallardo, T. La Calle, Pedro Estala, J. N. Bohl de Faber, Hartzenbusch, A. Rubió y Ors, B. Aribau, Coll y Vehi, whose "Dialogos Literarios" are filled with praises of the Bard of Avon; Nunez de Arce, who admirably paraphrased *Hamlet's* soliloquy, and finally, J. Benavente, named for his excellent translation of "King Lear."

These, therefore, and the native Spanish writers whom we have cited are sufficient testimony to show that the literary students of Spain sing no small part in the great chorus of the nations to the unique genius of the "immortal William."

William Furlong, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

[45] In his masterly study on Calderon, published in the "Enciclopedia Espasa," Vol. X., p. 659, Barcelona, 1911, he gives a very good appreciation of Shakespeare.

[46] "Historia de la Literatura," pp. 277-8.

[47] Menendez y Pelayo, "Crítica literaria," primera serie, Vol. I., p. 270.

THE PUTUMAYO ATROCITIES.

STEAMING up the Amazon beyond Manaos, the great rubber port of Brazil, and continuing the westward journey on the Upper Amazon, or Marañon, one reaches the Peruvian port of Iquitos, in the Province of Loreto.

It is through this port that the commerce of Peru flows to and from the Atlantic. Iquitos is situated north of the point where the Amazon receives the Ucayali, that affords access to the interior of the country on the south. West of Iquitos lies the great forest region known as the Montaña. Returning down the Amazon from Iquitos, you reach the Putumayo or Ica, an affluent of the Amazon, a thousand miles long, streaming in a southeasterly direction. The rubber country of which there is question, when we speak of the Putumayo atrocities, lies northeast of this river in the district bordering on two of its affluents, the Igaraparaná and Caraparaná. These two rivers originate near the watershed of the Japurá, another tributary of the Amazon, further east. Running parallel in a southwesterly direction, for some 300 or 400 miles, they end in the Putumayo, the Caraparaná, 600, and the Igaraparaná, about 400 miles above its junction with the Amazon. This region is bordered on the west by Ecuador, on the north by Colombia, on the south by Peru and on the east by Brazil. It is disputed territory, as it is claimed by Peru and by Colombia.

Colombia has recently reasserted its claim in a joint resolution, passed by both houses of Congress. The action of the Governments of England and the United States in calling upon Peru to put an end to the atrocities is said to rest on the "erroneous belief that Peru has sovereignty over the regions which have been the theatre of these crimes." Colombia affirms its legal right to be the only sovereign of the Caquetá and Putumayo and their affluents, of which it has been despoiled, while had she been able to exercise said sovereignty, the atrocities would never have occurred.

The district contains an approximate area of 10,000 square miles between the equator and the second degree of south latitude and the 72d and 74th of west longitude. The Igaraparaná is navigable for vessels of 100 tons to a point 220 miles from its mouth, where is situated La Chorrera, the principal rubber depot. The most important station on the Caraparaná, the smaller of the two rivers, is at El Encanto, near its junction with the Putumayo.

A native Indian population dwells on these two rivers, which, a few years ago, the Peruvian authorities estimated at from forty to fifty thousand souls. The majority of these natives dwelt on the Igaraparaná. The largest tribe was that of the Huitotos, between

the Middle and Upper Igaraparaná and the Caraparaná and north of the former toward the Japurá or Caquetá. Northeast of these lived the Andokes, Ricigaros and Boras, all of a different language. These tribes were divided into a number of subtribes or families, ruled by their hereditary caciques or captains, while they were, more often than not, at war with each other, their divisions rendering them an easy prey to the invader. The Huitotos are described as a mild and inoffensive people. Owing to the exactions of the whites and the cruelty practiced on the natives, this population has immensely diminished, being threatened with complete extinction.

As gold and land, exciting the cupidity of the colonizers, gradually decimated the Indian population in North and South America, thus in these latter years rubber has become their bane in the great basin of the Amazon. The twentieth century "conquistadores," in their exploitations of this most profitable article of commerce, did, as their sixteenth century predecessors had done before them, exploited the Indian, in order to exploit the rubber, and without any title whatsoever, save that of occupation, took possession of the forest and of its inhabitants. Forming themselves into bands and parties, under the designation of commercial associations, they enslaved the natives and forced them to work rubber for them, while any encroachment by a rival company, any theft of Indians, was followed by bloody reprisals.

By the end of the year 1904 a number of minor companies, most of them Colombians, were operating on the Putumayo, some apparently by concession of the Colombian Government. The firm of Arana Brothers at Iquitos served as intermediaries for these companies, supplying their wants and disposing of their rubber in the Iquitos market. Gradually Arana Brothers bought out the smaller companies or obtained possession of them by other means, until they almost acquired a monopoly of the rubber traffic on the Putumayo.

The system of "peonage" that prevails throughout the greater part of the Amazonian rubber region is rank injustice and slavery and facilitates the eating up of smaller concerns by larger ones. The employer gets a person, Indian or white, the latter being perhaps himself an exploiter of rubber labor, into his debt. The unfortunate debtor, unable to meet his obligations, becomes hopelessly involved, like a fly in the spider's web. Unable to pay, he is forced to work for his creditor upon the latter's terms, and often becomes his slave. A small capitalist or trader will, by accumulated obligations, thus see his business pass into the hands of his creditor, while he himself becomes a mere employee or worse.

At the period of which I am writing, the close of the year 1904,

a new element entered into the rubber industry on the Putumayo. The firm of Arana Brothers contracted with over two hundred Barbados Negroes in this and the following year for a term of two years, the first party to arrive consisting of thirty men and two women. On their arrival they found that the duties imposed upon them would be of an entirely different nature from those for which they had contracted. On landing at La Chorrera, the station on the Igaraparaná, they were armed with Winchester rifles and cartridges, and sent out into the forest to open up trade relations with the Andokes; in other words, to capture Indians and compel them to work rubber. Here begins a chapter of horrors of which we catch the first glimpse and to which we return.

Not all the Barbados men, however, were sent to the Putumayo, a certain number being employed in agricultural labors on the estate Nanai, near Iquitos, and others in divers occupations.

This state of affairs continued until the latter part of 1907, when the firm of Arana Brothers became a British company, with headquarters in London, as the Peruvian Amazon Rubber Company, Limited, a name that was subsequently changed to the Peruvian Amazon Company, Limited. The new company assumed the responsibilities of Arana Brothers.

Under the working of this company, as well as of its predecessor, several classes of persons have to be distinguished. First, there were the directors, either at London or Iquitos, then the agents at the stations on the rivers, with their subordinates, nearly all men with Spanish names, Peruvian, Bolivian or Colombian; further, the Barbados workmen, and finally the Indian population. The chief agents received a commission on the amount of rubber forwarded to Iquitos, and it was, therefore, to their advantage to obtain as much rubber as possible. The Barbados men were, to a great extent, employed as Indian catchers, or as executioners of punishment. The members of the salaried staff of an agency or station were known as "racionales." Besides these, each station possessed also a staff of Indian "muchachos," some of whom had grown up on the agency. These demoralized youngsters, armed with Winchesters, were employed in the catching of runaway Indians, and their hands were red with blood.

By means of these various instruments Arana Brothers and their successor, the Peruvian Amazon Company, extracted labor from the indigenous population, and the outside world remained ignorant of the horrors concealed beneath the thick foliage of primeval forests. However, these gradually leaked out, either by correspondence or by the report of those who returned from the dark regions of the forest.

Some of the earliest complaints came from the ecclesiastical authorities to the Government of Peru, while they, of course, sent their regular reports to their superiors in Rome. Iquitos and the Lower Putumayo are situated in the Apostolic Prefecture of Amazonas. On the upper waters of the Putumayo Colombian settlers had established religious centres, but their influence seems never to have penetrated to the Indians. In 1907 the Prefect Apostolic of Amazonas wrote to the Minister of Justice that it was not possible to establish any mission on the Putumayo, owing to the abuses of the rubber gatherers against the Indians, seizing their women and children. He had himself visited the Yaguas on foot, and in 1903 a mission had been established among them on the Ampiyaco. The "caucheros" (rubber men) obstructed the labors of the missionaries, being "interested that the savages should remain in the grossest ignorance, in order to exploit them with the greater ease." The Apostolic Prefect of the Ucayali writes to the Minister of Justice that in his region, in spite of the prohibitions of the Government, boys and girls are sold as slaves, and raids are made upon the Indians, numbers of whom are killed. Though acknowledging the beneficent labors of the missionaries, the Government seems to have taken no steps to remedy the abuses, at least on the Putumayo. The district north of this river remained a kind of no man's land, with little or no constituted legal or executive authority, so that the "caucheros" had full sway.

In the meantime reports began to circulate abroad, the British press took up the matter, and the attention of the world was finally attracted to the Putumayo horrors. The revelations came late, but they came at last to open the eyes of civilized man to the excesses perpetrated in the name of a British company.

Affidavits were taken from persons who had been eyewitnesses of the tragic scenes of the Putumayo regions, and they were published to the world. Articles began to appear in London in "The Truth," the "Daily News" and in other papers, as well as in publications elsewhere. The London Anti-slavery Society for the Protection of Aborigines took up and pushed the matter, moving the British Government to initiate an investigation.

Last year the Colombian writer, Vicente Olarte Camacho, published at Bogotá a work on the Putumayo cruelties, with an array of astounding facts derived from authentic documents.

The authorities in Rome set on foot a quiet investigation of their own, the result of which is given in the Encyclical of Pope Pius X., dated June 7, 1912, and addressed to the Bishops of Latin America. The following passage gives us an idea of some of the barbarities perpetrated:

"What indeed is so cruel and so barbarous as for reasons often trivial and not rarely for the mere pleasure of inflicting torture to put men to death by scourging or with red-hot irons; or suddenly attacking them, to massacre them, killing hundreds and thousands of them together; or to sack towns and villages, slaughtering the natives, of whom within these past few years some tribes have, we learn, been almost exterminated."

This is indeed a sad picture, almost beyond belief, but when we enter into the details of the British investigation our blood curdles. This investigation was set on foot by a letter from the Foreign Office to Sir Roger Casement, Consul General at Rio de Janeiro, informing him of his being chosen to accompany a commission of inquiry appointed by the Peruvian Amazon Company. The letter is dated July 21, 1910. The object of the commission was to inquire into the possibilities of commercial development of the company's properties and into the present relations between the native employees and the agents of the company. Sir Roger Casement was directed to report on the condition of British subjects and, secondly, on the treatment of the natives by the employees of the company.

Casement left England on July 23, 1910, and arrived at Manaos on August 16. The following day he proceeded to Iquitos, where he arrived on the 31st, to remain there until the 14th of September, when he embarked for the Putumayo, arriving at La Chorrera station on the 22d. He remained on the Putumayo, either at La Chorrera or in the outstations, until November 16. During that time he saw all the British subjects in the company's employ; a number of them were put through formal and complete interrogatories, and it is upon their united testimony that his report is based.

From the reports of the Consul General we learn that several times the British employees of the company were submitted to criminal ill treatment, and, among other things, that the burden of feeding the majority of the employees largely rested upon the native population, who were compelled by illegal force to labor in a variety of ways for the profit of the company. This compulsion was frequently accompanied by gross outrages, including flogging, torture and murder, while the Barbados men, instead of being employed as laborers, were forced to act as armed terrorists over the surrounding population and as the instruments of the cruelty of the agents in flogging the natives. To obtain laborers raids were made upon the Indians, who were to all intents and purposes the slaves of the company and of its agents. Their women were taken by the agents as concubines or given to the Barbados people, so that concubinage and libertinage became rampant.

The flogging of Indians was of ordinary occurrence. If they did not bring in enough rubber, they were flogged; if they ran away, they were flogged and sometimes flogged to death. Of the 1,600 Indians that Mr. Casement saw, the great majority, men, women and children, bore the marks of the lash, for blood was drawn copiously, and they were cut to pieces very frequently, sometimes their wounds festering, the flesh rotting and filled with maggots, creating intolerable stench. Some of the worst marked were small boys of ten or twelve years of age. It has been said that ninety per cent. of the Indian population bear traces of this kind of punishment.

Sometimes the victim died under the lash, and at other times death ensued some days later. Occasionally salt and water would be applied to the wounds as a healing process, but in some cases, where the wounds putrefied, the victim would be shot, and in others turned adrift "with maggots in his flesh" to die in the woods. Mothers were sometimes flogged on account of the shortage of rubber by their little sons, while the poor child stood by terrified and crying. Men and women would be suspended by the arms, often twisted behind their back and tied together at the wrists, their feet hanging high above the ground, and in this position they were whipped. It has happened that Indians were tied and forcibly held under water, until they became insensible, and on one occasion a man was accidentally drowned. To ninety-nine out of every hundred Indians flogged the lash was intended not as a punishment for some wrong done, but to make the Indian bring in more rubber.

Some were suspended by a chain, fastened around the neck, with the feet barely touching the ground, and sometimes when let down they would fall a senseless mass with their tongue protruding. Men and women were deliberately starved to death, and these unfortunates have been seen scraping up the dirt with their fingers and eating it.

A common method of punishment consisted of the "cepo," or stocks, in which the body was extended on the ground, sometimes for a long period. The victim was sometimes flogged while in the stocks, and many died therein, sometimes parents, in presence of their children similarly confined and helpless to assist them. Among the charges of cruelty brought against at least one of the company's agents was that of pouring kerosene oil on men and women and burning them alive, dashing the brains out of children, cutting off the legs and arms of Indians and leaving them thus to die.

Hundreds have died in the compulsory carriage of rubber to the stations, no food being given by the company on these enforced marches, while the unfortunates were paid little or nothing for

their labor. Add to all this the murders by shooting, barbarous decapitation and unmentionable modes of torture, and you catch a faint glimpse of the horrors of the Putumayo. You begin to understand that the Pope's Encyclical, instead of exaggerating, put matters very lightly. To form an idea of the state of affairs one must read Sir Roger Casement's reports, with the testimony of his witnesses. The heart sickens at the recital of these barbarities, and we shudder to think that men of our race could sink so deeply and Christians become so degenerate.

Sir Roger Casement sent in his report in the early part of 1911, and it was unofficially communicated to the Peruvian Government as well as to the United States. The Peruvian Government was urged to punish the offenders, many of whom managed to escape. Peru instituted a judicial inquiry, the United States Government coöperated with Great Britain and matters dragged along until in April of this year the President of Peru issued a decree instituting a commission to devise a plan of reform. On June 14 Dr. Romulo Paredes, special commissioner of the Peruvian Government, after a second visit to the Putumayo district, sent in his report to the Minister of Foreign Affairs. It is a strong corroboration of the investigation of Sir Roger Casement. Unfortunately, the worst of the criminals had fled, though some were since arrested abroad.

Sir Roger Casement's reports, with the correspondence relating to the matter, were laid before both houses of Parliament and published to the world in July of this year in a book that is for sale in London. The Pope's Encyclical had been issued in June, and in compliance with the desire of the Holy See, several English Franciscans have been designated to take up missionary work in the Putumayo.

In the midst of the many accusations and recriminations we also catch the echoes of an apologetic voice on the pages of "Peru To-day," the well-known monthly of my friend, Mr. Vavasour Noel, published in Lima. While the cruelties of the Putumayo are not denied, a certain Antonio Menacho is cited, who maintains that the Indians of those regions are cannibals. We are further told that Mr. Arana has been gathering data that may produce some startling revelations. Further, a commercial conspiracy is indicated in the following sentences:

"Many of us who see behind the scenes and know often more than we can prove in a court are convinced that while there may have been much brutality and crime in the many years that it took to conquer a savage portion of the world holding great natural wealth, the belated report of the British Consul General at Rio de Janeiro, and various circumstances of a supicious character, from

the very beginning of the appearance of evidence and going to the very root of this question, have satisfied those who have not lost their heads that a gigantic conspiracy and blackmailing scheme is being cleverly concealed behind the mask of interference by Great Britain.

"We charge that its public men are being used by an appeal to their humanitarian instincts as pawns in a great commercial raid to gain control of that very wealthy region."

It is also charged on the authority of a correspondent of "El Diario" that Colombians instigated the authors of the Putumayo crimes to injure the firm of Arana, the principal shareholders in the Peruvian Amazon Company. "Peru To-day" for September appears with a bloodcurdling picture of a dying Indian, with the inscription:

"Tortured and allowed to starve to death by Colombians in the Putumayo regions. Blamed on Peruvians." The picture is taken from "Variedades," a Lima illustrated weekly. That publication ascribes the deed to seven Colombians who are now in prison in Iquitos.

The "Inca Chronicle," published in Peru, at Cerro de Pasco, writes: "There has been much agitation lately, both in England and in the United States, over the state of affairs revealed in the rubber district of the Putumayo River. . . . That the natives are abused, imposed upon and ill-used goes without question. But that they are as ill-treated as the perfervid imagination of an English reporter has it, is absurd, and the charge refutes itself through its gross exaggeration.

"What is happening in the Putumayo is more or less what happens every time an inferior race is exploited by a superior one. From the time the Israelites were held in bondage by the Egyptians down to the Belgian atrocities in the Congo, history abounds with such instances."

It is thus evident that there is a tendency to blame others, for Colombians are accusing Peruvians and Peruvians are blaming Colombians, while England comes in for its share. All admit the existence of abuses, which some are endeavoring to minimize and to palliate, and it is human that all should try to shift the blame. The evidence in regard to facts, whatever palliation be admitted, is overwhelming. To my mind, the responsibility may well be distributed, nor is it for me to name the guilty parties. Any impartial reader may put his hand upon them. In justice, however, be it said that all seem to be struggling to right what is wrong. Both England and the United States are continuing their investigations, and the Aranas are lending their aid toward capturing the criminals indicted for cruelties. The manager of their interests

tells the world that no crimes are committed now. The Peruvian society, "Pro Indigena," which looks after the rights of the Indians, is trying to remedy the abuses, and the Peruvian Government has been awakened to the necessity of eradicating them, although, as the writer in the "Inca Chronicle" says, the Putumayo region is more accessible to Liverpool than it is to Lima.

With all this, it is the duty of the civilized world to see to it that there be no recurrence of these abuses. A vigilant eye should be kept, not only on the Putumayo, but on the whole rubber region within the territory of or bordering on the Republics of Ecuador, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia and Brazil. "Peru To-day" tells us that the vast forest regions in the heart of South America are full of desperate men whose greed for gold will cause them not to hesitate at crimes of violence.

The missionaries sent out according to the wish of the Holy Father will contribute their share toward planting civilization in those immense Amazonian regions, but unless the governments of the world are willing to coöperate with them, their labors will be neutralized by the cupidity and the execrable passions of wicked men.

At the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples, held at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., from October 23 to 25, the Rev. A. E. O'Meara, of British Columbia, read a communication from the London Anti-slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, requesting the coöperation of the Mohonk Conference in regard to the Putumayo atrocities. After some hesitation and deliberation the conference passed several resolutions of sympathy, thanking Peru for the steps it has taken and urging the prosecution of reform measures, with a thorough investigation of the rubber region of South America with the coöperation of the countries concerned.

These resolutions had been suggested by Hon. G. Brady, formerly Governor of Alaska; Rev. John McDougall, of Canada; Rev. A. E. O'Meara, of British Columbia; Rev. William Hughes and Rev. Charles W. Currier, of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions; Professor F. A. McKenzie, of Columbus, Ohio, and Dr. G. H. Blakeslee, of Clark University, Worcester, Mass., in a private meeting. Somewhat modified, they were unanimously adopted by the conference.

After the close of the conference the aforesaid gentlemen held another meeting, at which, in full sympathy with the resolutions adopted by the Mohonk Conference, they constituted themselves a provisional organization, with Hon. John G. Brady as president and Rev. C. W. Currier as secretary, to facilitate a permanent organization to secure international action in the interest of the

aboriginal races of the world, in coöperation with the Anti-slavery and Aborigines Protection Society.

There thus arises concerted action from the four points of the globe, and it is more than likely that the world will prevent a repetition of the Putumayo horrors wherever rubber is gathered.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

Washington, D. C.

CLEMENTINA SOBIESKA.

THE story of the Stuarts in the days of their prosperity is gay and debonair withal, but scarcely edifying. It was only in exile that they learned to practice the virtues, the lack of which had so often proved their downfall. The purity of the miniature Court of James II., the holy penitent, and his wife, Mary of Modena (of whom even that shrewd critic, St. Simon, said: "She died as a saint, and as she had lived"), at St. Germains, sustained by the royal generosity and courtesy of Louis XIV., was a standing reproach to the domestic disputes and scandals of the usurping sovereigns of England. That the still smaller Court of James' son, the third James, at the Palazzo Muti, in Rome, sustained by the bounty of the Pope, Clement XI., did not escape with the same spotless reputation is entirely due to the obstinacy and folly of James' wife, Clementina Sobieska, one of the most pathetic figures that flit across the scene of Stuart tragedy.

Next to the Baptistery at St. Peter's, over a door leading to the dome and opposite to Canova's angels guarding the monument to her husband and children, lies this unhappy princess. Don Donato, the tall sacristan of St. Peter's, smiles whimsically as the visitor pauses underneath the heavy pretentious memorial which George I. helped to erect to poor Clementina. "I do not understand," he says, smiling. "Some people—they are generally Poles—explain to me in bad Italian—oh, very bad!—that she was a martyr. Others —they are mostly English—scowl at her and tell me she made her husband miserable. A shrew, they call her. It is a little difficult."

It is difficult. The charming child who played in her nursery at being Queen of England; the high-spirited girl who enjoyed such romantic adventures at Innsbruck; the obstinate wife who sulked for over two years in a convent because her husband would not dismiss an old and valued servant; and the quiet woman who spent her last years doing good among the Roman poor and completely cutting herself off from all earthly pleasures and honors—it is a

little difficult to realize that they were one and the same person. Contemporary letters and memoirs are scanty, and however carefully and consciously the halting record is pieced together, there must remain much that cannot be explained; much that is obscure and contradictory; much that makes it difficult to pass judgment on Clementina's conduct as a wife. What is certain, is that she was the last woman James should have chosen. He to whom the world had from the moment of his birth been so cruel and so unjust; who suffered from the crime of being his father's son; whose very existence called forth a rebellion; and who, all his days, ate the bitter bread of exile, needed, if any man needed, a wife who would devote her whole heart to his comfort. He needed some one whose loving solicitude would help him to bear the repeated disappointments which rewarded his efforts to regain the throne which was his birthright; whose sympathy would give him courage to bear with the taunts and calumnies of his enemies; whose constancy would compenate him for the treachery of his so-called friends.

That was just what Clementina, with all her good points, was most unfitted for. There was some affection, but never much sympathy between them. Clementina, with her uncertain temper and her habit of meddling and her obstinate will, was a hindrance rather than a help, and an additional anxiety rather than a source of consolation. James never quite knew where her well-meaning efforts to further his cause were going to lead her and him; and she never could understand why he did not appreciate her interest in politics. The world called her a shrewd politician; her husband treated her as a spoiled child; it was certainly a little hard for them both.

It was only after several other princesses had been inspected and refused—one because of "a certain redness of the nose," another because she was "nothing better than a dwarf," and a third because she was too old—that Clementina Sobieska, granddaughter of the heroic King John of Poland (whose exploits against the Turks had made him the idol of Europe) and niece of the Emperor Charles VI. of Austria, was chosen—probably on account of her enormous dowry—to share James Stuart's fortunes. Prince James Sobieski, Clementina's father, was eager for the match, and the little bride herself, whose earliest ambition seems to have been to be Queen of England—one wonders why she set her heart on England in particular; there seems to be no clue to the choice—was by no means unwilling. The following charming letter to her royal lover has been preserved among Clementina's correspondence:

"I may, *sans sortir de la modestie,* declare to you, Sire, that paternal authority had not much trouble to make itself obeyed not to make my fate depend on that of your Majesty."

The news of the proposed marriage was received with dismay by the Hanoverian party in England. It was feared that many who had not bestirred themselves for James single would become ardent partisans of James married and likely to have an heir to his hopes. The birth of a child would certainly cause an outburst of Jacobite enthusiasm; therefore, the marriage must, at all costs, be prevented. King George I. accordingly used pressure to make the Emperor forbid his niece to marry James Stuart. Much against his will, the sorely tried uncle feebly protested with Prince James Sobieska, and later, by George's commands, detained the Princess and her mother at Innsbruck as they were on their way to Italy.

The story of Clementina's romantic escape has been told a thousand times. Four gallant Irish officers in James' service—Wogan, O'Toole, Gaydo nand Misset—rode to the rescue and managed to introduce Jenny, Mrs. Misset's maid, into Clementina's apartment. The young lady, so they told the maid, wanted to elope with Captain O'Toole, Gaydon and Misset—rode to the rescue and managed to help them. With encouraging words, the little maid changed clothes with the Princess, bidding her have confidence in "Captain O'Toole's merit and worth." Clementina entered into the spirit of the thing and played her part so well that she escaped without difficulty in Jenny's clothes and entered the carriage that was waiting for her, unseen and unsuspected.

Attended by Mrs. Misset and guarded by her Irish knights, she traveled night and day to gain the frontier. For three days she never fell asleep nor ceased asking Mrs. Misset excited questions about the manners and customs of the English court, showing plainly that she had high hopes of one day being *de facto* Queen of England. At length she slept, only to awaken when she was safely across the frontier. On hearing that she was in Italy at last, she alighted from the carriage, and with the piety which distinguished her through life, went into the nearest church to say a Te Deum for her escape.

On May 7, 1719, she was married, Lord Murray acting as James' proxy. Before the marriage began it was explained to her that her husband was detained in Spain, and might not be able to join her for some months, and that, therefore, for the sake of prudence, she must agree that, should the Emperor seize her again before she and James had come together, the marriage was null and void. This discouraging and unusual provision was made in James' interest. It would have been disastrous if he were bereft of his bride and left in the position of being unable to marry again during the lifetime of his seventeen-year-old wife. We are not told what Clementina thought of this arrangement. Probably to her sanguine

temperament the chances of capture, after her recent successful and exhilarating escape, seemed too remote to dwell upon. Probably, too, she was intelligent enough to understand that prudence, and not any desire to get rid of her, had induced James to make such a condition. In any case, she seems to have made no objection, and the marriage proceeded.

Meanwhile James' hopes were high. Spain, already at war with Austria, was preparing to invade England in the Jacobite interest. Four months later, however, the bridegroom returned to Italy after one more disappointment. He met Clementina at Montefiascone, and there a second marriage took place, the Pope having declared the first marriage (the "matrimonio de futuro," as Cardinal Gualterio called it) to be invalid. James was charmed with his bride, and wrote to Lord Mar saying she possessed all the virtues and no self-will. He brought her to Rome, where the Holy Father treated them both with magnificent generosity, giving them the Palazzo Muti, in the Piazza dei Santi Apostoli, as their residence and a villa at Albano for their summer quarters.

Seventeen months later, to the rage and despair of the Hanoverian party and the delirious delight of the Jacobites, Clementina gave birth to a son. At this time she was the idol of Rome. Her toilettes, her beauty and her charm of manner won many hearts that poor James, with his stiff, cold ways and slow intelligence, had failed to capture. Had Clementina only kept a still tongue in her head, she might have done her husband's cause a great deal of good; as it was, swayed by flattery, misled by traitors and taught to fancy herself a keen politician, she ended by doing a great deal of harm. Among her most gracious acts was the kindness she showed in offering to be godmother to the infant daughter of a certain Captain Walkinshaw, who had helped her husband's cause. Little did she dream, when she held the child in her arms and desired that she should be called Clementina, that the destinies of the infant prince and the baby Clementina would be linked in such a painful manner. Had not Bonnie Prince Charlie loved and sinned with Clementina Walkinshaw for so many years, he might never have ruined his own cause and have sunk so low as to drown his hopes in the wine cup.

Time went on, and Clementina began to realize that in all probability she would never be anything more than a queen "in partibus." Restless and ambitious and inclined to chafe at her husband's slowness, she was ready to exclaim with the fiery Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, "This is the best cause in Europe, lost for want of spirit!"

Clementina had plenty of spirit if James had not, and she set herself to work, never doubting that she, with her quicker brain,

could gain the throne for James without his help. Unfortunately, she was not quite so intelligent as she thought, and there were too many so-called friends at hand ready to flatter and mislead her, pretending to be her tools, but in reality making a tool of her. James watched his wife's tactics, first with uneasiness and then with despair. It was useless to remonstrate with her; she absolutely refused to listen to him; openly refused to obey him, and told him plainly that she was the better politician of the two, and that he might safely leave his cause in her hands. So they drifted rapidly apart, not even the birth of a second son, the future Cardinal, doing much to heal the breach.

There were in James' household two factions: the one loyal and devoted, led by John Hay, Lord Inverness; the other outwardly zealous, but secretly treacherous,, led by Lord Mar. Mar was a villain of such consummate ability that though he was receiving a pension of £2,000 from King George I. at the very time he was James' Secretary of State, not one of his colleagues ever suspected him of being anything but James' most devoted servant. James himself gave him his entire confidence, and, acting on his advice, dismissed from his service the faithful Murray, one of the best servants in the world. There still remained John Hay, and Mar was only too willing to encourage Clementina's unreasonable dislike for the man to induce James to get rid of him, as he had got rid of Murray. The reason for Clementina's dislike is not clear, but it is possible that, being a foreigner and regarding her husband's cause as the cause of heaven and the Catholic religion against a rebellious Protestant people, she found it difficult to understand that Hay, and hundreds of Protestants like him, were willing to shed the last drop of their blood for him whom they considered their rightful sovereign. Any such suspicion, however, fails to excuse Clementina for the way she treated James. When he refused to listen to her advice and dismiss Inverness, she flew into a passion and, without warning, retired to a convent, declaring her intention of staying there until Hay had left Rome and James' service. While at the convent she wrote a number of letters, giving various reasons to justify her action. She informed the Pope that she had been forced to act as she did because James had insisted on choosing a Protestant governor for Prince Charles. At the same time she wrote to other friends, to whom the religious question would not appeal, stating that James' infatuation for Inverness was the cause of her retirement.

Malicious tongues, encouraged by the crafty Mar, industriously spread abroad the lying report that an unlawful attachment for Hay's wife was the cause of the dispute between husband and wife.

The Pope put a plain question to Clementina on this point, to which she would only reply, parrot fashion, "Je n'aime pas ces gens là!" It is impossible to believe that she was jealous of any woman. James' very enemies admitted—with regret—that his private life was above suspicion, and no one could have known it better than his wife. It therefore seems inexplicable that Clementina, an intelligent woman, did not realize that had she, like Mar, been in receipt of a pension from the Hanoverian court, she could not have served that court better than by acting as she did. Yet she refused for two years to listen to reason. The Pope (Benedict XIII., who had succeeded Clement XI.) was at first impressed by what Clementina told him, and called upon James to explain what excuse he had for choosing a Protestant governor for his son. James replied that political reasons had induced him to take this step. The Prince would, he hoped, one day be King of England, and, that country being unfortunately Protestant, he judged it wise to bring up the boy under Protestant eyes, to disarm prejudice. The child's studies were in the hands of a Catholic tutor, and the Pope satisfied himself by examining the Prince that he was well instructed in the catechism. Thereupon the Holy Father informed Clementina that her fears were groundless, and advised her to return to her husband. James also wrote a very dignified and affectionate letter, remonstrating with her for her cruel, childish and unjust conduct:

"Votre conduite envers moi, les menaces qui m'ont été faites, et l'outrage publique de votre retraite dans un couvent, ne me touchent pas autant que le malheur et la honte auxquelles vous allez vous exposer par si étrange démarche. Je sens le tout, il est vrai, comme je dois; mais jusquà present je n'ai aucun ressentiment contre vous, car je suis a chaque moment convaincu que la malice et la finesse de nos ennemis en ont imposée à votre jeunesse et à la failblesse de votre sexe. Vous avez dû être persuadée, il y a longtemps, que je veux être le maître dans nos affaires et dans ma famille; mais il n'est encore trop tard de se reconnaître. Rendez-vous à la raison, au devoir, et a moi, qui attend que vos submissions à bras ouverts, pour vous rendre la paix et le bonheur autant que depend de moi. Que, si, malgré, les derniers efforts de ma tendresse vous persistez dans la resolution dont vous m'avez menacee, il ne seroit toujours une consolation de songer que je n'ai rien negligée pour vous empecher. Je vous conjure encore une fois, ma chere Clementine, d'y penser serieusement.

"Signé: JACQUES R."

Much has been said of James' very mediocre brains. It is said that he differed from his half-brother, the Duke of Berwick, insomuch as while the Duke's countenance was "sad and severe," James'

was "sad and silly." Probably, though not brilliant, he was not quite so silly as his enemies liked to believe. At any rate, the letter just quoted shows a sober judgment and a dignity which do him credit. Perhaps, however, with all its generosity, it was not the most tactful method of treating a young woman who prided herself on her intelligence and knowledge of the world to tell her that the "cunning of the enemy had imposed on her youthfulness and the weakness of her sex."

One wonders why James did not appeal to her maternal feelings and remind her of the two small children she had deserted. At no time does she seem to have been a very devoted mother, however, for even after what we call her conversion she preferrd to work among the poor, giving her whole time and thoughts to her charitable undertakings, than to make up for the time when she had left them by living in the happiness of her little boys. We are told that they never went out except when their father took them, because their mother had neither time nor liking for amusements and gayety. Obstinate as she remained to the end, no one could persuade her that noble as was the work she was doing, her real work lay at home with the husband and children she had always neglected.

Meanwhile, while still in her convent, she began to ruin her health by severe and constant mortifications. In fact, there is no doubt that at this time her habits, acting on a feeble constitution, were the exciting cause of the lung trouble from which she died four years after her reconciliation with her husband. Poor woman, no one could induce her to believe that a humble submission to her very patient spouse would be worth all the hours of prayer in the convent chapel which so edified the good nuns! It was only after two years that peace was made. It is said that the Pope told Clementina that she would be deprived of the sacraments if she did not bend her stubborn will and return to her home. However this may be, suddenly, and apparently of her own free will, she wrote to James (then at Avignon) that she desired above all things to please him, and was on the point of joining her children at Avignon or Bologna. The letter very characteristically contained no excuses, and was signed by his "very humble, very obedient and ever faithful wife!" At the same time her humility, her obedience and her faithfulness did not prevent her from refusing James' first request—that she should join him at Avignon, where he was forced by political reasons to remain for the time being; nor did it prevent her from going against his express commands by bringing with her, as governess to her children, Mrs. Shelton, former governess to the little Princes and spy in the pay of Lord Mar.

At the news of this woman's arrival at Bologna with his wife, James' patience—it really had been wonderful—gave out. Writing to Cardinal Gualterio, he says that he feels that he can scarcely refrain from taking "some violent step to release myself from a wife who, by her return to my family, has shown, if possible, a stronger spirit of rebellion than by her flight into a convent, and who knows, by the finest dissimulation and hypocrisy, how to cover her true dispositions to the public." Certainly, reading Clementina's letters at this period, one is forced to conclude that she was either a pious fraud or else that she was absolutely without a sense of humor. The difference between her dutiful, wifely protestations and her wilfully disobedient conduct is great to admit of any other explanation. Fortunately, however, James was not driven to take the "violent step" he contemplated. At the last moment, hearing that her husband was about to leave Avignon for Bologna, Clementina had the grace to dismiss Mrs. Shelton. James, delighted at her submission, received his wife with every token of affection and forgiveness, making no allusion to the past and sparing her all those reproaches which a less patient husband would not have failed to make. Neither Mrs. Shelton nor Lord Inverness was mentioned, and James, disarmed by Clementina's silence, flattered himself that his domestic troubles were over for good and all.

Hay was at this time, by his own unselfish wish, in retirement, lest the sight of him should cause Clementina to repent of her good resolutions. Such fears were by no means groundless, but James, deceived by her submissive behavior, wrote to Inverness in a hopeful strain, saying that he had no doubt that his wife would be quite willing to agree to any step which he (James) saw fit to take. "She leads," he added, "a most retired, melancholy life, and though I have encouraged her to alter it, I don't believe she will, but that's her affair, and I shall not constrain her."

Clementina was, in fact, Clementina still! She possessed many virtues, no doubt, but she did not know the meaning of humility and submission. Secure in the consciousness of her own good intentions and never doubting her own judgment, she refused to obey even the commands of her confessor, Blessed Leonard of Port Maurice, when he told her that the life of mortification she was leading was ruining her health and not pleasing to God, and that increased charity towards her husband and children was her first and most important duty. Charitable, in a sense, she had always been, and no one was more beloved among the Roman poor. She not only gave large sums out of her private purse to the various benevolent institutions she took an interest in, but she spent the greater part of her time, after her return to James, among the

outcast and the wretched. Those whom she benefited extolled her as a saint, and not a few hinted that she was a martyr to a tyrannical husband!

Meanwhile, during the first few weeks of the reconciliation, there was peace between them. It was only when James, deceived by her silence, began to speak of recalling Inverness that the storm broke. To his astonishment, Clementina declared passionately that she had only returned on condition that Inverness was to be banished forever, and went on to say that in the event of his return she would retire again to her convent without more ado. James, at his wits' end, replied that she could please herself, whereupon she burst into tears and declared she was enciente. This piece of news, of course, altered the case, and James, feeling that his hands were tied, gave way, promising that Inverness should remain in retirement, lest his presence should injure Clementina's health and endanger his hopes.

There is no doubt that at this time Clementina's mind was unbalanced, for she fell a prey to the fixed idea that Inverness—about whose virtue and honor there can be no possible shadow of doubt—was plotting to poison her. James behaved with his usual patience, humoring his poor wife and granting her lightest whim, until it was discovered that her hopes had been unfounded. If he suspected that she had deliberately deceived him, James was too generous to accuse her, though his enemies, with less scruple, did not hesitate to spread abroad the utterly false statement that a chance meeting with Lady Inverness had awakened Clementina's jealousy and caused a miscarriage. From that time Clementina's health began to wane so rapidly that James made up his mind to devote himself entirely to her, letting her have her own way in every detail and consenting that Inverness should remain in retirement. Probably this faithful and sorely tried servant would never have seen his beloved master again had not the death of Pope Benedict XIV. and the accession of Cardinal Ciorsini, under the title of Clement XII., made a fresh move in the affair.

The new Pope's sympathies were entirely with James in his domestic difficulties, and he lost no time in telling Clementina that her conduct was highly disedifying and altogether inexcusable. Clementina held out with her usual obstinacy, but at length, after two months, informed James, without comment, that she was willing that Inverness should return. James received her submission with delight and tenderness, and after a long conversation between husband and wife, a true and lasting reconciliation was made between them. Inverness and his wife returned, and Clementina, at

last convinced of her injustice and folly, treated them both with royal kindness and condescension, showering honors on them both in public as well as in private and omitting nothing which could repair the wrong she had done. Soon after Inverness' return James went to Naples for his health, and the letters which he and Clementina exchanged during their separation show how completely they were now united.

"I can think of nothing but the satisfaction I shall feel when I shall see Caro Mio again," she writes.

James ends his reply with, "Cara mia, je suis tout á vous!"

Their happiness was not to last long. Four years after her return Clementina died, at the age of thirty-three. She was sincerely mourned by her husband and by persons of all classes, but especially by the poor, whom she had always loved. It is not surprising that they called her a saint and invoked her intercession after death. The following letter, now among the Stuart papers, is written in Latin and dated June 30, 1781:

"I, Ferdinand Sturm, noble of Hirschfeld, and a Doctor in Medicine, once in the year commended myself to the Venerable Maria Clementina, Queen of Great Britain, and in the merits of her name, I petitioned God Almighty to restore my son's health. I prayed from the inmost depth of my heart, making vows that I promised to fulfill till my life's end in honor of this Advocate. Then I returned to the sick room, where I found my son lying in his mother's arms and suffering from an attack of bleeding from the nostrils, whereby he was relieved of more than two pounds of blood within the space of an hour and a half. Joyfully, the child cried out to me: 'Dear father, I am well again at last!' Then, voluntarily rising from his bed, he was from that moment restored to his original health. And many other boons have I since obtained by means of this powerful patroness."*

This is only one of a good many miracles believed to have been wrought through the intercession of Clementina, and at one time it was thought that a formal application would be made to obtain her beatification. No such plea has ever been advanced, however, and although no wise person would presume to anticipate the decisions of the Church, it does not seem likely that any such cause will ever be seriously considered.

The magnificence of Clementina's funeral was long afterwards remembered and talked of in Rome. The body, embalmed and clothed in the habit of a Dominican nun—for Clementina was a Tertiary of St. Dominic—was borne by Dominicans to the Basilica of the Santi Apostoli. There it remained for three days and nights,

* Herbert Vaughan, "The Last of the Royal Stuarts," p. 9.

laid on a splendid catafalque in the choir, near the bodies of the Holy Apostles Philip and James. The church was draped in black, edged with silver, and lit by the light of thousands of wax tapers. Night and day the Papal Guards stood by the corpse with drawn swords, while a continual stream of visitors came to gaze their last at Clementina's quiet face and to pray for the repose of her soul. On the third day her ladies-in-waiting reverently removed the Dominican habit and clothed their mistress in royal robes of purple velvet and ermine. A crown was placed on the head that had never worn it in life, and a sceptre placed in the pale hand. Thus in death Clementina received the honors she had craved and always been denied.

Thirty-three Cardinals assisted at the solemn office of the dead, which proceeded the funeral procession to St. Peter's. In that procession walked the students of the English, Irish and Scotch Colleges in Rome, all the religious confraternities in their picturesque habits, a detachment of cuirassiers and a vast number of people of all classes who had loved Clementina. St. Peter's was draped in black, adorned with the royal arms of England, Scotland, Ireland and Poland, and the splendor of the Requiem Mass equaled that which was sung for another princess of romantic history—Christina of Sweden. During the De Profundis the royal robes were taken from the body, which was clothed once more in the Dominican habit. When all was over the coffin was lowered in the crypt. Later her heart was removed, enclosed in an urn and placed in the Basilica of the Santi Apostoli. Before it James was wont to spend many hours a day in tears and sorrow. This act was considered by some people to be a proof of repentance for the wrong he had done his wife. It is difficult, however, to label his conduct as a husband as anything but affectionate, faithful and most long-suffering. There may, of course, be facts which have not come down to us—one is tempted now and then to think that there surely must be—which would account for Clementina's strange behavior. It is certain, however, that, whatever she may have suffered, she never accused James of anything worse than of having chosen a Protestant governor for his son and of having refused to dismiss Inverness from his service. Nor does it seem likely that a woman who stood up for her rights as loudly and obstinately as Clementina had done would have hesitated to speak, and speak publicly, had she had other grievances to air. James, like every one else, had faults, and it is possible that had he been less tenacious of his marital authority and had he condescended to pretend to consult Clementina's opinion, even if he did not see his way to take her advice, much friction between them would have been avoided. But he

always treated her like a spoiled child, and nothing could have been more galling to her pride.

One cannot help thinking—perhaps it is an idle fancy—that Clementina had been ill advised and had mistaken her vocation. With her intelligence, her generous instincts and strong principles, and above all, with her very sincere piety, she might, with proper training, have made an excellent nun. One can imagine she would have made a very conscientious and capable reverend mother superior.

E. Cowell.

Bishop's Stortford, England.

THE INSCRIPTIONS OF SINAI AND THEIR RELATION TO CERTAIN FACTS OF SCRIPTURE.

DOUBTLESS many have seen, if not in the originals themselves, at least in illustrated books and journals, examples of those strange Egyptian characters such as were sculptured or written on the obelisks and mummy-chests and other monuments of that mysterious land. From the days antecedent to Christianity those characters were before the learned world, but yet they were as mysterious in the meaning they were intended to convey as the Sphynx itself, that other Egyptian puzzle to the learned of all ages. Writings they were known to be, but yet the key to this mysterious writing no one was in possession of till, just a century ago, it turned up, as if by chance, in the most natural manner possible.

It was in this way: In 1799, whilst Lieutenant Bouchard, an artillery officer in the French army of occupation, was building the fort of San Julien at Rosetta, a town on the Delta, he came across a monolith in black granite, ten feet high by three and a half feet wide, on which was inscribed writing in three columns—one column of the inscription was in the unknown Egyptian characters, since called hieroglyphics; the second, in cursive characters, evidently a simplification of the preceding, and the third, in the Greek characters and language.

Here was a find which might put the world at last in possession of the locked-up literary treasures of this land of mystery. The Greek could, of course, be easily deciphered, and the inscription turned out to be a decree of the priests in honor of Ptolemy Epiphanes, commanding that his statue be erected in all the temples of the kingdom and that divine honors be rendered to him on his

birthday. The learned knew that the writings on the other columns were to the same purpose; but how to decipher them was the question.

Though the Rosetta stone was, through the chances of war, put in the possession of the English, and is to be seen to-day in the Egyptian hall of the British Museum in London, yet it is to a Frenchman that we are indebted for the triumph of unlocking, mainly through it, the treasures of the Egyptian world of letters.

Champollion, a talented young Frenchman, determined to try and solve the problem of the mysterious language of the monuments by a serious study of the Coptic or ancient Egyptian language. This language remained the vernacular of the Copts; that is, the remains of the ancient Egyptian people, down to the middle of the seventeenth century, and is still the liturgical language of the Monophisites, one of the Christian sects which has lingered in the East from the early days of Christianity.

Noting that certain of the characters in the first two columns were enclosed in a cartouch or parallelogram, he conjectured that they would represent the name of the king himself. True enough, they responded in number to the letters of the name Ptolemy. A second bilingual monument in Egyptian and Greek was discovered about the same time in the Isle of Phila, on the first cataract of the Nile, on which was inscribed in cartouch the name of Cleopatra. The same test applied produced the same result. Afterwards, a third cartouch, with the name of Alexander, was in the same way identified. Here, then, were the characters of three full names deciphered, making in all twenty-seven characters, fourteen of which were different ones.

Want of space does not permit a further inquiry into the process of identification. Suffice it to say that this plucky Frenchman, in the course of his short life of forty-two years, was not only able to decipher 260 different phonetic characters (the whole number of hieroglyphics deciphered up to the present, including variants, phonetic complements and determinatives, is between 3,000 to 4,000); but from his deathbed he dictated an Egyptian grammar which has been the basis of all the Egyptian learning acquired in later years.

An early difficulty that Champollion had to meet with and master was that of monophones and polyphones; that is, the deciphering of different characters representing the same alphabetical sound and of the same characters representing altogether different syllabic sounds, together with their determinatives; also the distinction between alphabetic characters, syllabic characters and ideographs, or characters representing complete ideas. This same difficulty in a

far more complicated form had to be met with and solved in an altogether different family of languages, the cuneiform—and solved it was, in such a manner as to confer everlasting credit on human perseverance.

To conclude about the hieroglyphics, for that is the name given to those strange Egyptian characters, they are imitations of material objects, images of every kind, borrowed from all the kingdoms of nature, and even from the imagination; besides the hieroglyphics, properly speaking, which are the characters employed in public monuments, there are two other species of Egyptian characters, derived from the former, it is true, but yet distinct from them, namely, the *hieratic* and the *demotic*.

The hieratic, or sacred characters, are abbreviations and simplifications of the hieroglyphic, and were employed in transactions where a more cursive hand was desired, and the demotic, or popular writing, which is of a later date, may be said to be the writing of the civil and business life of the Egyptian people.

So much for the deciphering of the hieroglyphics. It might be an appropriate subject for an article, the pointing out the knowledge of antiquity which their deciphering has put us in possession of, and more particularly the showing forth the use that that knowledge has been put to under the providence of God in strengthening the relation of certain important facts of Scripture and in testifying to the authenticity of Scripture itself.

Egypt has been called the land of mystery, and a land of mystery it had been deemed from the most ancient times; and this veil of mystery has hung round it, its institutions and people, almost down to our own day.

It is to the credit of the great Napoleon that when he conducted his expedition into Egypt in 1798-9 his army was accompanied by a whole host of scientific men who went to study the monuments of this ancient land of the Pharaohs. This led to the first methodical investigation of its antiquities, an investigation which continues with unabated interest down to the present day. What, as a result, with the key of its literary treasures in hand and with the wonderful discoveries—one would rather say with the resurrection of its ancient monuments from the slumber of the grave where they lay for thousands of years, we come to know a great deal indeed, comparatively, concerning the life and activities of its people, and this from the most primitive times. What is more, that knowledge has been given us under the providence of God as a great weapon to combat and overcome the enemies of religion.

For an instance of this, this article will deal principally not with Egypt proper, but with the Peninsula of Sinai, a dependency of

Egypt from the most ancient times, even as now. It was impiously asserted by Voltaire that the books of the Law, otherwise called the Pentateuch, could not have been written in the time of Moses, because of the barbarism of the times, and because, as he asserted, the custom of writing on papyrus was unknown at that early epoch. And later critics of the same sacred books, founding their judgment in part on the same unsound premises, came to the conclusion that they were written not earlier than the seventh to the ninth century before Christ.

What are the facts? We have writing in hieroglyphics going back thousands of years before Moses' time, writings not revealing the crude efforts of a barbarous people, but in the last stage of perfection, and giving details of the most elaborate polity and working of a highly organized and powerful monarchy. What is more, there are still extant many documents in papyrus that are contemporary with Moses, and some even that were written hundreds of years before his time.

It had been known for many years that the turquoise ornaments which were worn by the wealthy Egyptians in ancient times and which in such lavish abundance decorated their mummies after death were quarried from the rocks of Sinai. Moreover, it was known that the precious ornaments could be procured only by expeditions, the cost of which could be undertaken only by royal authority. For Sinai is an inhospitable land, consisting almost entirely of barren rocks, interspersed here and there with wadies, or canyons, where only a little corn and some vegetables could be raised by the few Arabs who inhabited it.

It was customary then for the Egyptian monarchs to send, from time to time, expeditions into the peninsula to quarry the precious turquoises and to smelt copper from the rich ores that lay embedded in the mountains, and this could be done only at certain seasons, on account of the intense heat of the place. These expeditions had to be supported through means of relays of camels and asses, which carried provisions and water from the shore and from the distant wells. All this was done with the order and precision which only Egypt was capable of.

These expeditions were usually accompanied by artists and scribes who chiseled on the mountainside sculptures and inscriptions to the glory of the Pharo who sent them, and often giving precious details concerning the expedition itself.

For the commendable purpose of research and survey the British School of Archæology in Egypt in 1905, with the aid of disbursements from what is known as the Egyptian Exploration Fund, commissioned a number of scientists, at the head of whom was

Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie, to study, to take paper squeezes of and to catalogue more accurately those precious monuments of antiquity.

It was not a day too soon. For when the expedition arrived at Wady Maghareh, the chief centre of interest, they found that the workmen of English mining companies had, three years previously, blasted away most of the inscriptions previously known, in search of turquoise; blasted away the rocks on which were chiseled those sculptures and inscriptions, many of which had come down untouched by the barbarians during the space of from six to seven thousand years. This work of devastation was afterwards continued by the natives, with the result that many of the most important still remaining were destroyed. Blasting, as the chief of the expedition complained, was continually going on at those mines, and the nearness of sculptures made no difference to the operatives.

When the expedition arrived a large block with an inscription of Sahura of the fifth dynasty (who reigned 4426-4413 B. C.) was being broken up, and they were just in time to save the inscription, which is now in the Museum of Brussels. And while they were in course of copying the numerous inscriptions of the twelfth dynasty a native workman came and effaced them with a hammer during the dinner hour. Of those barbarous proceedings Mr. Petrie bitterly complains, and says that the Goths were cultured in comparison to those dividend-hunting Englishmen, for while the Goths—barbarians as they were—preserved the writings and monuments of ancient Rome, those modern commercial companies ruthlessly destroyed monuments in comparison to which those of ancient Rome were but as yesterday.

To find a parallel to the destruction wrought by those speculating companies one must look to the Turkish destruction of the Acropolis of Athens, or Mahomet Ali's wrecking of temples to build factories and magazines.

As previously mentioned, the expeditions sent periodically by the Egyptian Pharoes to Sinai were accompanied by artists who chiseled, high on the sandstone rock, sculptures and inscriptions to the glory of their masters. Those sculptures and inscriptions were executed principally in the vicinity of the two great mining camps at Wady Maghareh and Serabit-el Cadem, and they have reference to monarchs of several of the dynasties from the twelfth back to the first dynasty.

The most ancient of those sculptures represents Semerkhet, seventh king of the first dynasty, who is said to have reigned 5291-5273 B. C., and his general. His figure is drawn in three attitudes, in one of which he is represented as striking to earth a Beduay chief,

to commemorate his victory of the Semites of his time. On a smooth, natural face of the sandstone rock, at 394 feet above the valley floor, the scene of this king has been engraved by sinking the ground and leaving the figures in relief. It is a piece conceived with great power and truth. And it tells well for the preservative qualities of the climate of this ancient land that the sculpture is to-day, after 7,200 years, as it is claimed, as clear-cut and perfect as if it were only yesterday that it left the sculptor's hands.

Another thing to note, and which is just as well mentioned here (and it is a thing that will cause thought), is the remarkable fact that the sculptures and other artistic monuments of this age, say from 4000 to 5000 B. C., show a much higher artistic attainment than do those of the later periods of Egyptian history, and that, moreover, hierography had already arrived at the last stage of development.

The next monument left standing was that of Sa-Nekht, the founder of the third dynasty, who reigned 4945-4919 B. C. This is the first inscription directly connected with the mining industry, as it was placed over an early mine. The head and face of this king is strongly Ethiopian in character. It is a type familiar among the Sudanys of the Egyptian army, and goes with a dark brown skin and very truculent character.

Other sculptures are those of Sneferu, the last king of the third dynasty (B. C. 4750). With those sculptures are to be found plenty of hieroglyphics. Like Semerkhet, of the first dynasty, Sneferu is represented in one of those scenes smiting a Beduay; his name is in relief before him and incised behind him with the inscription: "Sneferu, the Great God, giving power, firmness and life, all health and all satisfaction of heart forever, smiting the countries."

The next is Sahura of the fifth dynasty (who reigned 4426-4413 B. C.).

An interesting one is that of Cheops of the sixth dynasty, the builder of the great pyramid.*

It should be mentioned before going further that the expedition, seeing the wanton destruction of monuments that was going on all around, determined to detach several of the most precious, which they did, and with the exception of the scene of Semerkhet, which they were unable to detach, being high out of reach, they may be seen to-day in the Museum of Cairo.

* The great pyramid of Cheops, at Giezeh, stands on a basis 764 feet square, and thus covers nearly thirteen acres. It is 450 feet high, and was, when perfect, covered with white marble. It contains 82,111,000 cubic feet of masonry, and, according to Herodotus, it took the labor of 100,000 men for twenty years to build it. It was Napoleon who calculated that its mass of material would build a wall eight feet high and eighteen inches thick from Paris to Moscow.

Close by the other great mining camp of Serabit-el Cadem the sculptures and inscriptions are still more numerous, and there is here besides the ancient temple of "Hat-Hor," "mistress of the turquoise," presumably the Phœnician "Istar," "Asteroth," revealing a Semitic ritual and worship many centuries earlier than the Exodus.

Space forbids to go further than make mention of them and to note that the oldest trace of occupation here is of Sneferu, the last king of the third dynasty (about 4750 B. C.).

To some, however, the antiquity claimed for those monuments may seem incredible, and the questions may be asked:

First: Have we data to sustain the alleged antiquity of those monuments?

Second: What of the teaching received in our early days that the human race was created some 4000 years B. C.?

Proofs exist to sustain the antiquity of the Sinaitic monuments; incontrovertible ones, as may be seen from an outline of the system on which Egyptian chronology is based, and in a general way from these proofs themselves, though space forbids entering as fully as desirable into more detail concerning them. Those who may wish to study the question more fully should refer to Flinders Petrie's work on "Researches in Sinai," the chapter on the "Revision of Egyptian Chronology."

The whole checking of Egyptian chronology rests on the unquestionable fact that the Egyptians ignored the leap year and counted only 365 days to the year. There have been defects in every calendar, simply because the motions of the earth have no exact relation to each other or to those of the moon.

The Mohammedan calendar, for instance, falls short eleven days each year, by taking twelve lunar months as the year, which only amounts to 354½ days. Thus the whole of the Arab months shift round the seasons in about thirty years.

The Egyptian slipped his months backward a quarter of a day each year by not keeping up the enumeration, as now done, with a 29th of February every fourth year. As the months thus slipped backward or the seasons appeared to slip forward in the calendar, in 1460 years the months shifted round all the seasons. (Strictly, the year does not contain exactly an odd quarter of a day, but 242, so that the rotation of the months would take place in 1,500 years. But as the earth's rotation is slackening, the fraction was exactly a quarter of a day in historic times (say 3231 B. C.), and it may be called so, as the Egyptians did.

In order to observe the seasons exactly, the mere changes of heat or of growth are too vague, and the Egyptians saw that some connection between the sun and the stars should be noted. As they

had no exact timekeeper, they could not compare the sun by day and the stars by night, so they adopted the first appearance of a star in the glow of sunrise. For their star of observation they took "Sirius," the brightest of all the stars, otherwise called "Sothus," "Canicula" or "the dog star." According to Censorinus, who wrote A. D. 239, "The beginning of those years is always reckoned from the first day of that month, which is called by the Egyptians Thoth, which happened A. D. 139 on the 12th of the kalends of August: i. e., 21st July, on which day Sirius (Canicula) regularly rises in Egypt."

Thus the new year's day of the months—the 1st of Thoth—coincided in 139 A. D. with the fixed astronomical feature of the rising of Sirius, in the dawn just before the sun, which was on July 21. (This, of course, differed by a day or two, by reason of difference of latitude, in different parts of Egypt.) The same would happen on each recurring cycle of $365\times4=1{,}460$ years backward. Hence it follows that the 1st of Thoth, the Egyptian New Year's Day, occurred on the 21st of July in the year 139 A. D. above mentioned and in the years 1322, 2782, 4242, 5702 B. C. In the intermediate years it occurred a day earlier in the calendar every fourth year, shifting backwards through the seasons.

In going backward the first great datum that is met is that on the back of the "Medical Ebers papyrus," where it is stated that Sirius rose on the 9th of Epiphi (the eleventh Egyptian month), in the 9th year of Amenhotep I. As the 9th of Epiphi is 56 days before the 1st of Thoth, Sirius rose on that day at 4×56 years$=224$ years before the dates given above; i.e., 1322, etc., B.C. As only 1322 B. C. can be the epoch here, it results that $1322+224$ equals 1546 B. C. for the 9th year of Amenhotep I., 1554 B. C. for his accession. And as Aahmes I., his predecessor, the first king of the eighteenth dynasty, reigned twenty-five years, 1579 B. C. is reached for the accession of Aahmes I. and the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty. This is not defined within a few years, first, owing to four years being the equivalent of only one day's shift; second, owing to the rising being perhaps observed in a different part of Egypt at different times; third, owing to various minor astronomical details. But this gives 1580 B. C. as the approximate date for the great epoch of the rise of the eighteenth dynasty.

At the next step is found the parting of the ways of the two great schools of Egyptian chronology, and it arises from the point as to whether there should be allowed an interval of 206 years for the reign of the kings of five dynasties—the thirteenth to the seventeenth—or rather 206 years plus a whole cycle of 1,460 years, that is, 1,666 years. But this must be explained.

Antecedent to the rise of the eighteenth dynasty, that is, 1580 B. C., a papyrus document (that from Kehun, now in Berlin) makes mention of another Sirius rising on the 17th of Pharmuthi (the eighth Egyptian month). This was in the seventh year of Senusert III., of the twelfth dynasty. This shows that the 17th of Pharmuthi then fell on the 21st of July, which gives the seventh year of Senusert III. at the one or the other of two possible dates, viz., either at 1874 B. C. or a cycle of 1,460 years earlier, that is, in the year 3,334 B. C. As he reigned probably 38 years, that is to say, 31 years after the above date, he died either in the year 1843 B. C. or 3303 B. C. Amenemhat III., his successor, reigned 44 years, as his monuments show. Amenemhat IV., the next king, nine years, and Sebekneferu, next and last king of the twelfth dynasty, four years, according to the Turin papyrus. These reigns bring the close of the twelfth dynasty either to the year 1786 B. C., or a cycle of 1,460 years earlier, viz., 3246 B. C.

It is necessary, then, to decide by the internal evidence of the monuments of the kings which of these dates is probable, by seeing whether the interval of the thirteenth to the seventeenth dynasties was 1,786—1,580=206 years, or else 3,246—1,580=1,666 years.

This question has been merely ignored hitherto, and it has been assumed by all the German school that the later date is the only one possible and that the interval was only 206 years.

One of the latest accessible writers on the subject, the learned Dr. Hyvernat, of the Catholic University, Washington, writing in the Catholic Encyclopedia, adopts the calculations of the German school.

Setting aside, then, altogether for the present the details of the examine only the monuments and the Turin papyrus of kings, which list of kings and dynasties given by Manetho, the Egyptian historian, was written with full materials concerning this age, with a long list of kings, and only two or three centuries later than the period in question.

On the monuments are to be found the names of seventeen kings of the thirteenth dynasty. In the Turin papyrus there are the lengths of reigns of nine kings of this dynasty, amounting to sixty-seven years, or seven years each on an average. If this average length of reign is applied to only the seventeen kings whose reigns are proved by monuments, 120 years must be allowed to them, leaving out of account entirely about forty kings more of the same dynasty in the Turin papyrus, as being not yet known on monuments. Of the Hyksos, i. e., the shepherd kings of the sixteenth dynasty, the monuments of three are certainly known, and without here adopting the long reigns stated by Manetho, there must yet be allowed at

least ten years on an average; that is to say, thirty years for these kings. And in the seventeenth dynasty there are at least the reigns of Kames and Sekhent-neb-ra, which cover probably ten years. Hence for those kings whose actual contemporary monuments are known there is required:

Thirteenth dynasty, 17 kings, 120 years; sixteenth Hyksos, 3 kings, at least 30 years; seventeenth dynasty, 2 kings, 10 years—in all 160 years.

This leaves but 46 out of the 206 years to contain 120 kings named by the Turin papyrus and all the Hyksos conquest and domination excepting thirty years named above.

This is apparently an impossible state of affairs, and those who advocate this shorter interval are even compelled to throw over the Turin papyrus altogether and to say that within two or three centuries of the events an entirely false account of the period was adopted as the state history of the Egyptians.

This difficulty has been so great that many scholars in Germany and every one in the rest of Europe have declined to accept this view. If, however, the Sirius datum is to be respected, there must be allowed either 206, or else 1,666 years between the twelfth and eighteenth dynasties. As neither of these seemed probable courses, it has been thought that the Sirius datum itself was probably in error, and here the matter has rested awaiting fresh evidence.

At this point two Sinai monuments come in with decisive proofs that the Sirius datum is quite correct. Into the elaboration of those proofs space forbids us to enter, but it may be taken for certain that these two new data prove conclusively that the Sirius datum in the twelfth dynasty is correct and not liable to some misinterpretation.

And now to face this large question: Which of these two cycles of the 1460 year period, the earlier or the later, is to be accepted? It has been shown that there seems to be no possibility of the later period being true, as that leaves only 46 years free for all the large number of unknown kings of the thirteenth to the seventeenth dynasties. Yet, on the other hand, one would shrink from the idea that there was as much as 1,500 years in this interval. There is one professed clue to settle the matter—the history of Manetho. Unfortunately, there are extant only some fragments of this history preserved in the writings of Josephus (antiquities, etc.), Julius Africanus (221 A. D.), (epitome) and Eusebius (326 A. D.) (prepar. evangelica). This writer compiled his history in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphos and very possibly for the great library which this king created in Alexandria, afterwards destroyed by the

Caleph Omar, to the great loss of scholarship concerning the ancient world. This work was in its original form an authority of the highest order. Compiled under the active patron of learning and written by an Egyptian priest who knew how to use all the documents that had come down to his day, it has the strongest claims to belief. Thorough and systematic the Egyptian records were, even in the fragments left to our times. The chronicle of all the years and reigns of the first five dynasties is unmatched in any country, and the fragment of it at Palermo shows how early a systematic record existed, while the Turin papyrus, of the eighteenth dynasty, or before, giving the length of the reign of every king, with summations at intervals, shows how the same taste for precise reckoning was kept up in later times. It was then to complete copies of such works that Manetho could refer when constructing his history for the Greek world. In this fragment of Manetho he refers to events in the history of the Egyptian kings back to those of the first dynasty and earlier.

The antiquity attributed to the Egyptian monarchy by Manetho seemed so incredible that many doubted its correctness and tried to explain it away by saying that the dynasties of which he speaks overlapped each other, or were contemporary with each other, rather than successive. The deciphering of the inscriptions of Sinai, together with the discovery of other monuments of those times, such as the tombs of the kings of the first six dynasties, go to prove the correctness of Manetho and the truth of the facts he relates concerning them.

Moreover, one of the documents discovered in recent times, the famous Turin papyrus, which testifies to have been written 1,200 years before Manetho's time, goes to show the absolute correctness of his statements, as well as the fidelity of the Sinaitic inscriptions, and all go to prove the fidelity of the monuments of that wonderful people, whose written records thus go back more than 7,000 years, a fidelity to which, particularly in the case of the chronicles of the first five dynasties, the records of no people or line of monarchs in modern times can approach.

Here is an example to show this correctness and that both Manetho and the Turin papyrus, written twelve hundred years before, or say 1,500 years B. C., drew from the same source.

The Turin papyrus gives 1,755 years for the first to the sixth dynasties and Manetho gives 544 years from the seventh to the eleventh, making in all 2,299 years, while Manetho gives 2,300 years as the total to the end of the eleventh dynasty. Hence he had exactly the same total for the first to the sixth dynasties, as we find given 1,200 years before in the Turin papyrus.

Manetho has been accused of double reckoning, that is to say, of giving two contemporary dynasties of kings (for there have been contemporary kings of Upper and Lower Egypt), as if they were consecutive. Every instance in which this has been supposed has broken down when examined in detail. Not a single case of overlapping periods can be proved against him. On the contrary, there are two excellent proofs of his care to avoid such errors. The eleventh dynasty is known by the monuments to have covered at least one century and possibly two, yet Manetho only gives forty-three years, evidently because he reckoned the tenth dynasty as legitimate, and until that ended he did not count the eleventh dynasty, which was partly contemporary with it.

Again, in the case of a single reign is found the same treatment. It is well known that Taharga was reigning about twenty-nine years before the accession of Psametek I. Manetho placed three ancestors of Psametek before him, reigning twenty-one years in all. Here, it has been said, is a clear case of double reckoning, of overlapping reigns.

But just here is Manetho's care shown, for he cuts down the well-known reign of Taharga to eight years (or 18, according to different readings), and this eight years with the 21 of the three other kings makes 29 of Taharga. In fact, he has only counted Taharga until he takes up what he regards as the legitimate line, and thus he ignores the 21 years of the reign which overlapped those of the other kings.

Starting from the well-fixed point of 1580 B. C. for the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty, take Manetho as best represented by his earliest synoptic, Julius Africanus. His statements give for length of dynasties from the thirteenth to the seventeenth inclusive:

Dynasty.	Years.	B. C.
Eighteenth	...	1580
Seventeenth	157	1731
Sixteenth	518	2249
Fifteenth	284	2533
Fourteenth	184	2717
Thirteenth	453	3170

Admitting, then, the longer period of 1,666 years as approximate interval of the thirteenth to the seventeenth dynasties (there is a discrepancy of some seventy-six years, as can be seen, between the two computations, but this can be explained), and adding to this 1580 B. C., the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty, the year 3246 B. C. is reached as the approximate date of the end of the twelfth dynasty. As this removes the chief difficulty which confronted the chronologists, under the guidance of the monuments, the Turin

papyrus and Manetho, there can confidently be assigned an interval of 2,264 years for the length of the combined reigns of the kings of the first twelve dynasties and give the accession of Menes, the first king of the first dynasty, as approximately 5510 B. C.—7,422 years ago.

And now to dispose of the Old World notion that the human race was created only 6,000 years ago, or 4000 B. C. Those who gave those computations were only commentators of Scripture, whether Jewish or Grecian, and the truth or falsehood of their computations in no way affects the truth or authenticity of the Scripture relations they treat of. The fact is, there is no chronology at all, strictly speaking, in the Bible. Not that the Bible does not tell us how many years the patriarchs lived, or how long the kings of Juda or Israel reigned. But that is not chronology in the proper sense of the word, and the Bible nowhere tells us in what year of the world this or that Scriptural personage was born or died, or that remarkable event occurred. The Old Testament knows no era, no point of fixed departure from which to compute other events, as, for instance, the birth of our Lord. It contains, indeed, chronological data, that is to say, elements of calculation which one can employ to construct a chronology, although no sacred writer presents a complete chronology. But even these chronological data are insufficient, and this for two reasons: first, because the true ciphers written by the sacred writers have not come down to us unaltered. This is seen by the divergence of 1,350 years between the chronology of the Septuagint and that of the Hebrew Bible, reproduced in our Vulgate. The Greek text, which is the most ancient version of the Old Testament, counts 2,242 years before the Deluge; the Hebrew and the Vulgate, 1,656. The Samaritan Pentateuch counts only 1,307. From the Deluge to the vocation of Abraham the Septuagint has 1,147 years, the Hebrew and the Latin 364 years and the Samaritan 1,017. Of those ciphers, so different, which are true? Are they not all altered? This is a question which no one can answer; criticism is impotent to resolve the problem. The Church has made no pronouncement.

Again, the Roman Martyrology, adopting the computation of the Septuagint, places the Creation 5199 B. C. Since the sixteenth century critics have succeeded in causing to prevail generally the chronology of the Hebrew text, which places the Creation 4,000 or so B. C. Thus the true ciphers written by the sacred writers have not come down unaltered.

In the second place, the genealogical lists given in the Bible are incomplete, and hence there are chronological pitfalls everywhere in the sacred text.

Take, for instance, the genealogy of our Lord as given by SS. Matthew and Luke. Matthew gives forty-two generations from Abraham to Christ, divided into three categories of an equal number of generations; fourteen from Abraham to David, fourteen from David to the transmigration of Babylon, and fourteen from the transmigration to Christ.

This was arrived at only as a result of the custom of the Jewish scribes, from whom the Evangelist copied (who looked for symmetry in their genealogical tables) to leave out unimportant links. Thus, in the present instance, he deliberately omits at one leap the triple link of the wicked Ochozias and his son and grandson, Joas and Amasias, and simply says, as may be seen (Chap. i., v. 8), "Joram begot Ozias," though Ozias was simply his great-grandson.

Again, St. Luke in the same genealogy of our Lord gives a link more than the Hebrew text and the Vulgate of the Book of Genesis, namely, Cainan. And this is the more remarkable, as it refers to one of the postdiluvian patriarchs. It is said in Genesis (Chap. xi., vs. 12-13), "Arphaxad lived thirty-five years, and begot Sale, and he lived after he begot Sale three hundred and three years." St. Luke says (Chap. iii., v. 36), "Sale, who was the son of Cainan, who was of Arphaxad." It is possible, then, that there are omissions in the list of the patriarchs as well antediluvian as postdiluvian, and this sole possibility of omission permits reply to all the objections that can be raised in the name of the divers sciences, history, archæology, paleontology, etc., against the Bible chronology. If science come to prove that the date which is generally assigned for the creation of man is not sufficiently remote, it will result that the systems of chronologists, of which there are nearly two hundred, are false; but the text of the Bible will remain always itself outside the controversy.

It can be seen, then, that the holy books are full of pitfalls for the unwary, and that there is in reality no chronology in the Bible to be adopted or contradicted, and that the sacred writers, who were bent on conveying to mankind the message inspired to them by the Holy Ghost, had no intention whatever to give to them the curious information as to what was or was not the age of the human race. Even the length of our Lord's public life is not known, whether it was one, two, three or fours years, and there are the names of learned and distinguished Biblical scholars who advocate each one of these periods.

Hence it is that the modern rationalists and higher critics are building for themselves a fanciful windmill to tilt their lances against when they build up a chronology for the Bible for the

pleasure of overturning it by invincible arguments drawn from antiquarian researches or scientific discoveries.

A. M. Skelly, O. P.

Portland, Oregon.

CIVISM, CIVILTY AND URBANITY.

I.

SCHOOLS of philosophy are not wholly consistent: sometimes their inconsistencies appear to predominate, and then especially it is safer to say that certain doctrines are to be found in one or other of these bodies than to say that it is simply the doctrine of the body. With such reservation made, it may be taken that while Stoics held it to be the duty of a man to give his activities for the service of the State unless he could prove a right to special exception, Epicureans, though less anti-civic than the Cynics, would have been more inclined to pronounce that a call to civic service was the exception which needed to be established. This accords with the Epicurean watchword, "Lathe beosas," a theme which Plutarch develops in his treatise on "Living Hiddenly." The better cause assigned for such a life is not laziness or disregard of the public good, but the difficulty and the undesirability of pleasing the people who are so irrational and tend to demoralize the wise man. The Stoics here were not thoroughgoing. To their individual wise man, if he could be found, they assigned the right to judge for himself about Aristotle's dictum that suicide is forbidden by duty to the State.[1] On this suggestion no doubt many an individual would have claimed for himself the wise man's prerogative and have said in regard to his fellow-citizens what a modern writer has said, as if in maintenance of that Platonic Justice which lies in keeping to one's own concerns: "The wise mind their own business; they have a horror of interference. Suppose a man wants to leave this world? Ah, well, it is a pity; but it is his own life, and perhaps he has grown tired of it. So no one interferes. He minds his own business and his business is to be happy." So far did this writer, Samuel Butler, push the doctrine of testing a good man by the degree in which his life made for happiness that he wished the commonly accepted ethics to be largely modified by this

[1] It is not clearly said that Epicurus took his own life, but Seneca (Ep. 26) and Cicero (De Fin. I., 15) say that he left suicide optional.

[2] Stohaeus Florileg, vii., 25. Stoics also had the idea that the unhappiness of the individual mattered not if it contributed to make the universe happier.

standard. To the utilitarian standard the Roman Stoic Musonius set the limit that a man useful to many in life ought not to go out of it unless his death would be useful to still more.[2]

Another limitation of quite a different order arises from the contempt which Stoics professed for all material goods, and therefore for much that States deem of such prime importance that neglect of these interests would in their eyes ruinously upset their politics and oppose their doctrine of utilitarianism. Similarly they would judge with strong disapproval the Stoic rigor of abstinence from corrupt practices, from war and from the preference of one's own country before that of any foreigner.

If we recur now backwards to the predecessor of Stoics and Epicureans, Aristotle, he insists on the sociability of man as developed successfully in family, village and State.[3] He measured all values teleologically by reference to the final end. Inasmuch as he placed this in contemplation and denied the sufficiency of "political life,"[4] he might seem to make no provision for social welfare in the civil State; but he corrects this apparent one-sidedness by assigning a secondary value to material comforts. When he mentions openly the rival claims of public and private life he allows right to both; but on the whole his reply shirks a clear decision.[5] He acknowledges that public service offers the widest field for those moral virtues that go to make the perfect and happy man, who is fully a man in his whole nature and not merely on his contemplative side. Still he has to concede that thereby contemplation is hampered. He compares the case with that of the best state which divides its efforts between its internal and its external interests. He sees in political virtue a repetition in larger characters of private morality without identification of the two regions. Machiavelli, on the contrary, saw here almost complete opposition, but would have called political expediences or necessities by the name of civic virtues opposed to private.

At any rate, the Greek in general regarded it a barbarism to let individualities anarchically triumph over civic harmony. Spartans in particular enslaved the citizen to the city; Athenians saw this and boasted their own comparatively greater liberality, as is set forth in the famous speech of Pericles.

II.

To-day much is made of civism as a thing to be taught from early schooldays, mainly, perhaps, as a lesson illustrated from other

[3] Polit., cc. 1 et 2.
[4] Eth. I., 5.
[5] Polit., cc. 2 et 3.

lessons, but also as a direct subject of instruction and exhortation. Boy scouts, cadet corps and similar organizations are used to enforce the patriotic teaching. It is desired also to lay hold of youths leaving school and enroll them in other bands, such as that of the British Boys' Training Association, for the defense of the country and for the promotion of its internal economy. In the smaller area municipal usefulness is demanded; in the village the parish needs its official and its unofficial helpers. If the town seeks urbanity, the country district wishes to escape the reproach of rusticity. So is formed in a larger sense that "civility" in praise of which Louis Stevenson has spoken: "This inbred civility, to use the word in its completest meaning—natural and facile adjustment of contending liberties—seems to be what is required to make us a governable nation and a just and prosperous country." Speaking of a party of clubable persons who got on so well at a house in which he was a lodger during his French travels, he remarks: "We wondered at the strange failure of the race upon the larger theatre."[6] The party which he describes were at Fontainebleau, under a landlord who trusted to their honest dealing through control of their collective opinion, and left them pretty much to their selections out of his supplies in a most unbusinesslike way. Sitting up at night after "mine host" had retired, they went down to the cellar and brought up what they fancied. After a time the total consumption of drink was calculated and the expenses divided among the company, with a rough proportion of liabilities. A non-compliant member was dismissed. Bills were not presented till asked for and credit was freely given.

Those who look to the dark side will question the etymological rights of civility and urbanity. They will point to a basis of justice in the attacks made upon governments, parliaments, law courts, municipalities, parish councils and other institutions of the country. They will deny the urbaneness of our towns. They will say that the ideal state of civility is "a pattern laid up in heaven," not found in Babylon, or Nineveh, or Athens, or Rome, or London, or Paris. It was not on earth that the enthusiastic Emperor Marcus Aurelius could find his "dear city of Ceclops" converted into the "dear city of Zeus." St. Augustine's contrast will remain true between the city of God and the city of the world, and the city of civility will always be poorly verified in the cities of earth; the heavenly Jerusalem will be poorly verified in any Palestinian Jerusalem. At all times the laborer after improvement of town life will find an insuperably large task on his hands.

It may, however, be protested as a counter objection that the ideal of a heavenly city must always be fatal to a prosperous city of earth. Here we must distinguish precept from counsel. Religious

[6] "Across the Plains," pp. 130-131.

societies founded on the renunciation of material wealth are not meant for the world at large: they form the higher following or "serving of one master," not the obligatorily prescribed form for all. When the excuses for not attending the Great Supper were made, no voice was raised in condemnation of them that man had no right to give time to his newly purchased lands or animals: it is a duty in its own place to be fulfilled by men of the world who are not condemnably wordlings. Least of all would the man who pleaded "I have married a wife and therefore cannot come" have improved his position by saying: "I have married a wife, but that is never a prohibitory consideration on my movements."[7]

We must then allow its own value to natural civism and civility, and even ruralism of the better sort. Also we must not look too exclusively on their failures. Manners have been much improved by social life in towns. The larger intra-communion of the social units has its instructive, disciplinary and ennobling influences, which are given all the freer course by the excellence of the police, which removes the worst obstacles to progress. Where the turbulent elements cannot be controlled, the pioneers of civilization cannot make headway. Culture in the monasteries of Anglo-Saxon England was unable to achieve much success when any day the invading Danes might utterly ravage the homes of study in a way more fatal than companionship with street arabs undoes the efforts of town schools to give some polish to the boys and girls who are being educated. Still, a vulgar home life is a daily check on a more refined school life. All we can boast is that to-day the course of advancing civility in our towns is free from many hindrances that beset its path in mediæval and post-mediæval times, while the means of positive education are greatly multiplied in number and efficiency.

III.

We have thus in the terms Civism, Civility and Urbanity proposed to us as real objects of interest, which do not lie beyond practical attainment. But we should not rest too much in the external controls. The politeness of mere convention is liable to endless failures in the absence of internal charity. No man is unfailingly good-mannered who is not good-hearted. The occasions arise when human respect for the agreed-upon code ceases to exert pressure, and then the incivilities of the professedly polite men are often very noticeable and betray the want of genuine excellence. The defect is sometimes—which does not mean always—flagrantly illustrated

[7] Nevertheless even the Old Testament saw that a soldier was hampered if he had home ties; hence those were to leave the campaign who had newly built a house, planted a vineyard, betrothed a woman. Deut. xx., 5, 6, 7. *Cf.* I. Machab. ii., 50.)

in unexpected examples when the outwardly polite Englishman leaves his restraining society at home and has to do with uncultured races whose good or bad opinion he equally despises. For thoroughness of civility what we want is mutual support from inner considerations and outer pressure united.

On the side of the latter care has to be taken not needlessly to multiply conventionalities. Those who are born to elegant life and to assured position in society are apt to be much freer than those who try to rise to consideration by the long-detailed rules of the etiquette book, violation of which is so dreaded by the narrow circle of a small cathedral town, with its clerical and legal aristocracy, minutely criticizing each other and having the power to spread ill reports speedily all round its own confined area. In these days of easier traveling the tyranny of the petty circle is not what it used to be; but it has its terrors, and few individuals are strong enough to defy it with impunity. "You have never lived in the country," says one of Mr. E. F. Benson's lady characters to her girl companion, "with two aunts who were the daughters of a defunct dean. You can't understand the rules, you lucky person. If you have settled to go home on Wednesday, on Wednesday home you go, and nothing short of an earthquake may stop you. And the earthquake would have to be a bad one. Oh, Maud, we are alone, aren't we? If so, D—, but not otherwise."[8] Of course, this imperfection of manner is not to be found in all daughters of deans, and of course some daughters of London fashion would be a great deal better if they had imbibed some of the discipline that they might have got in a clerical home at a cathedral city of small size.

All the same, it remains true that cultured manners are gainers by the absence of artificial rules which are quite unnecessary and do not contribute to real culture socially estimated. In a human intercourse, which must inevitably present many vexations, it is a pity needlessly to increase these exactions of a conventional etiquette, which only the stronger mind will be able to disregard and to bear the penalties of their disregard, judiciously and justifiably. Such justification does not hold against every artificial arrangement. Some conventions are absolutely necessary.

In conclusion, a remark may be made on the idea that the code of politeness, being a law, needs a penal sanction, which must be in the hand not of any official authority, but of the social group. In that fact lies a danger of some lapse into barbarism under cover of maintaining the higher civilization. For some of the social

[8] Another utterance is: "The cathedral people are seven-day clocks; they strike with absolute regularity, and are wound up for the week at the cathedral service on Sunday morning. It is the spring and centre of their life."

penalties are apt to be much out of proportion and decidedly rough. Even the merely verbal castigations used to punish the manners of others easily turn out to be themselves very bad manners. No small part of etiquette should be not to offend by censure or reprisal, and under irritation, reasonably or unreasonably given, to keep a good temper and a spirit of charity. No ill-tempered, uncharitable person can ever be moderately civil. On the other side, no one, however good, can escape being inculpably the occasion of dissent and displeasure to others. Under such conditions of intercourse he cannot claim tolerance who does not practice it. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, long-suffering, gentleness, meekness, temperance, not desirous of vainglory, not provoking one another, not envying one another." (Galat. v., 23-26.) These "fruits of the Spirit" will produce a politer society than will any etiquette book applied from the desire to shine in elegance of manners as a fashionable adornment or as an advertisement for self-promotion.

JOHN RICKARY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

CATHOLIC IDEALS IN MODERN FRENCH FICTION.

Le dix-neuvième siècle a eparpillé
Le vigntième siècle unifiera.
—*Leon Daudet.*

La jeunnesse est patriot, traditionaliste; elle se rit des nombreux Thalamas qui voulaient la modeler sur leur triste image.—*Maurice Barrès.*

IT is unfortunately the worst sort of French literature that gets most réclame outside France, just as many of the shadiest Parisian café-chantants draw their chief support from an Anglo-American audience, some out of curiosity to see how wicked the French really are! Vulgar and ignoble books are thus forced on the attention of the public, and most people are unconscious of the extraordinary *revirement* which has taken place in French fiction during the last ten years. It would be easy to cite fine books dealing with various problems, but here we must confine ourselves to works animated by specific Catholic ideals: works in which the authors seek to prove that in the Christian tradition lies the solution of the problems of individual and of social life, works in which religion is shown as a vital force influencing the lives of the characters, a source of strength in temptation, a source of consolation in affliction.

Among the works of older writers may be mentioned: "L'Etape," "Un Divorce," "Le Tribun," Paul Bourget; "Deracinés," "Collette

Baudoche," "Amities Françaises," Maurice Barrès; "Partage de l'Enfant," "La Lutte," Leon Daudet; "Blé qui lève," René Bazin; "Fils de l'Esprit," Yves Le Querdec. And among those of younger writers: "L'Immolé," "Fosse aux Lions," Emile Baumann; "L'Ivraie," "Les Egarés," "Lumière à la Maison," Jean Nesmy; "Yeux qui s'ouvrent," "Pays Natal," "Croisée des Chemins," Henri Bordeaux; "Les Arrivants," "Dame de Bourg," Jean Yole; "Dame des Levriers," "Avila des Saints," Alfred Poizat; "Ce qui demeure," Paul Renaudin; "Ascension," M. de Pomairols; "La Splendeur Catholique," Paul Lœwengard.

Most of the literature at the end of the nineteenth century in France is marked by irony and skepticism, and the explanation is probably to be found in the following remark made by M. Maurice Barrès of his contemporaries: "Ah, qu'ils etaient mediocres mes compagnes les fils des vaincus! comme ils ont laissé retomber quasi eteondre les flammes françaises."

For a time after the defeat of '70 the thought of *La Revanche* and the national pledge of redeeming the lost provinces sustained the spirit of the French, but by degrees, owing to reasons which will be dealt with later on in this paper, the power gradually passed from the Catholic Conservative party into the hands of those who found in "Le Clericalisme c'est l'ennemi" a device much more to their taste, since it opened out prospects of great monetary gain from confiscated Church goods. The "sons of the vanquished," growing up in the subsequent atmosphere of materialism, drifted naturally into a state of dilettantism and *amoralism* and welcomed the theory that since religion, patriotism and duty were but words, the only attitude possible for a cultured youth was one of ironic fatalism.

Those to whom an ideal of some sort was a necessity found one in the doctrine of "Art for Art's Sake," according to which Art was the first and only law, and the entire duty of the artist was to give full expression to his inspiration without a thought as to the moral effect likely to be produced by his work. This doctrine of "art for art's sake" was interpreted by many as "enjoyment for enjoyment's sake," and not unfrequently its votaries in their pursuit of æsthetic sensations strayed into devious paths of vice. Writers in their anxiety to prove their superiority to "bourgeois morality" lauded everything abnormal to the skies; therefore, since the ordinary person associated beauty with health, they, as *conoscenti*, only found æsthetic pleasure in disease and ugliness, and disclaiming living flesh and natural colors, concentrated their attention on skeletons and putrefaction.

The pernicious effect of this perverse culture has been well ex-

posed by M. Paul Lœwengard in "La Splendeur Catholique," which appeared in 1910, and attracted great attention, as much by its fine literary quality as by the natural sensation caused by the conversion of the author from Judaism to Catholicism. Prior to his conversion, M. Lœwengard was famed in literary circles for his rather erotic pagan poems, and his case may be taken as typical of his time, proving as it does that it is by literature and art that the mind of cultured youth becomes inoculated with skepticism and vice. Not the least interest of the book is that in following M. Lœwengard through the many phases he traversed before he finally found peace in the Catholic faith, we see mirrored in rapid survey most topics of contemporary life. By turns *Baudelairien, Nietzscheen, amoraliste, anarchiste,* M. Lœwengard finally reached a period of negation in which he repeated with Pierre Loti:

"Je ne crois à rien ni à personne. Je n'aime personne ni rien. Je n'ai ni foi ni esperance. Rien n'existe de tout ce qu'on nous a enseigné à respecter. Il y a une vie qui passe à la quelle il est logique de demander le plus de jouissance possible en attendant l'epauvante finale qui est la mort."

If, however, M. Lœwengard is unsparing in his strictures on the literature of his time, which he states made him *un desequilibré,* he also dwells on the potential power of literature for good and pays a special tribute to "Les Deracinés," by M. Maurice Barrès, which, falling into his hands one day by chance, made a deep impression on him and was the means of setting him on the right path.

Fortunately, all this chaos and materialism proved to be more *Parisian* than *French,* a distinction that many people lose sight of, taking Paris—or rather a small section of the capital—to represent France and forgetting that around the glittering centre, where these ephemeral creatures live their feverish hour of folly and of vice, stretch the fair lands of France, the reservoir of the nation's strength and permanence.

In time the proverbial *bonsens francais* reasserted itself, and in considering the causes of the *revirement* which subsequently took place, it is of the utmost importance to realize that it has all sprung from national feeling. Patriotism is the foundation of French character, and amid the general debâcle of all generous convictions which, as has been indicated, followed the disaster of the Franco-Prussian War, the word *Patrie* never wholly lost its prestige, and from it, even in the absence of religion, could still be drawn the saving doctrines of heroic devotion and obscure self-sacrifice. Thus, when French writers saw that these subversive individualistic theories when put in practice produced a state of moral and social anarchy which threatened the very foundations

of their country, many of them, conscious of their own responsibility, cried "Halt!" and henceforth strove to guide the current of public opinion into safer channels. If we trace the evolution of those who now proclaim their adherence to Christian ideals, we generally find that it was love of country started them on their route of conversion: first they came to see the necessity of moral laws, then they realized that there can be no real moral force without religion, and thus little by little they were led back to the faith of their fathers. It is natural, therefore, that we should find these writers combating strenuously against the modern cosmopolitan spirit which saps the springs of patriotism by detaching the individual from the social group of which he should form part, sharing in that sense of responsibility without which life becomes rootless and ephemeral.

Before coming to the group of writers who may be described as *convertis*, honorable mention must be made of one who, unaffected by the anarchy raging around him, kept ever on the sane lines of Christian tradition. René Bazin is preëminently the novelist of provincial France, and his work is too vast to be examined here in any detail, though occasional reference will probably be made to one or other of his books. The art of M. Bazin, in its poetry, simplicity and truth, has produced literary types corresponding to the creations in art of the Barbizon painters, Millet and Rousseau, and in his novels, as in their pictures, the artist, while faithfully reproducing provincial France, reaches down to the bedrock of life, and thus achieves the supreme distinction of being at once parochial and universal.

Among the *convertis* the names of M. Maurice Barrès and M. Paul Bourget stand out in special prominence. M. Maurice Barrès, known in the early nineties as one of the most audacious of the individualists who initiated the decadent *Culte de Moi*, is now an ardent advocate of Provincialism—i. e., the local patriotism of Brittany, Picardy, Lorraine and the other old French provinces, which is still alive, though more than a century has elapsed since the French Revolution and their nominal disappearance. M. Barrès is also a zealous defender of Catholic interests in the *Chambre des Deputés*, on the grounds that experience has revealed to him that Catholicism is synonymous with social health and that it implies the most elevated sentiments, and also because he is conscious of the inseverable *points de suture* that unite France to Catholicism. It is much to be regretted that M. Barrès, who was indirectly the means of M. Lœwengard's conversion, does not himself seem able to take the final step which would make him a member of the Catholic and Apostolic Church.

In "Les Deracinés" and all his subsequent works M. Barrès emphatically condemns the individualistic and cosmopolitan tendency of his previous writings and promulgates the *culte de la Terre et des Morts,* which advocates the strengthening of all the mysterious ties which in the obscure depths of the soul attach the individual to his race and country. At times readers are estranged by a certain narrowness in M. Barrès' outlook, but all who believe in the beneficial powers of nationality must be grateful to him for the many beautiful passages in "Les Amitiés Françaises" which describe the close union exiting between a country and the native people. The aim of the book is to indicate the lines on which a Lorraine boy should be educated in order that he may grow up in harmony with his surroundings and thus become heir to the vast national inheritance which has accumulated during the course of centuries. Every land, M. Barrès believes, has her own music and only to her own children does she communicate this peculiar rhythm which puts them in communion with the living and the dead, awakening the sentiment of a common interest, so that each one feels himself a link in a great chain, a moment of something that is immortal.

Some people, as M. Barrès well remarks, think they have acquired much culture, when in reality they have only encumbered their mind with foreign matter that it cannot assimilate. However celebrated a work of art may be, it is valueless to us unless it is in sympathy with the natural rhythm in our souls. Hence, though our national culture may not be finer than that of other countries, it is of infinitely greater value to us, and it is an irreparable loss for a child to grow up out of his natural setting, as no foreign culture can ever compensate for the loss of that to which the deepest fibres of his heart would have responded.

In many other works of the present time we find writers dwelling on the sustaining force of nationality and the necessity of maintaining the spiritual bond which unites us to the land of our birth.

M. Henri Bordeaux in "Croisée des Chemins" illustrates the force of ancestral influences often lying dormant in our souls until awakened by some sudden emotion. The theme of "Le Pays Natal" is indicated by the title, and at the conclusion of the book, after recalling the legend of the giant Antious, who, fighting against Hercules, drew fresh vigor from the earth each time he touched it, M. Bordeaux thus finely expresses the solidarity of generations:

"Les hommes sont ainsi. En revenant sur le sol natal ils reprennent les trésors de passé et la foi dans l'avenir: car ils y retrouvent l'esprit des ancêtres et ils comprennent que toute œuvre durable depasse la vie d'un homme."

In "Ascension," by M. de Pomairols, a remarkable book of elevated mysticism, embodying a sincere if discutable conviction, this same sense of the continuity of the ages finds beautiful expression in pages where the author describes the South Wind of his native place. This all-pervading breeze blowing at eventide across the plains penetrates every living creature, and enveloping the people of to-day in the same atmospheric influences as those breathed in by their ancestors, forms a bond of union between the successive ages.

"La Fosse aux Lions," by M. Emile Baumann—perhaps the most gifted of all the young Catholic writers of the present time—is pervaded by the rhythmic harmony existing between the earth and its natural workers, and the author's charm of style and ardent faith make the book a prose poem on rural life. It is to be feared, however, that only in *la vieille Vendée* would it now be possible for the hero Philippe de Bradieu to lead the patriarchal existence he desired, continuing the immemorial tradition of his ancestors who were at once the guardians of the faith and of the land. As in the case of the author's first novel, "L'Immolé," to which we shall return later on, exception has been taken to some of the passages in "La Fosse aux Lions." It would, however, seem that, while so many authors devote their talents to rhapsodizing over the pleasures of illegal passion, it can scarcely be amiss that a Catholic writer, who, as we shall see, does not hesitate to preach complete self-immolation when necessary, should here employ all the splendor and poetry at his command to depict the joys of Christian nuptials. In fitting conclusion to these notes on nationality may be given Philippe de Bradieu's noble ideal of patriotism: "De l'amitié entre les paroisses, un plus large amour pour cette paroisse plus large qui a nom la France et la plus large de tous pour la Chretienité que la terre ne peut contenir parce qu'elle s'appelle aussi la Communion des Saints."

II.

Pour ma part, cette longue enquête sur les maladies morales de la France actuelle . . . m'a contrainte de reconnaître à mon tour la verité . . . que "pour les individus comme pour la societé le Christianisme est a l'heure present le condition unique et necessaire de santé ou de guerison."—*Paul Bourget.*

Plus j'ai observé notre époque plus j'ai cruvoir que toute une part des maux dont nous souffrons venait de la meconnaissance de cette loi, formulée egalement par le catholique Bonald et par l'imperique Auguste Comte, par le romancier Balzac et par le naturaliste Haeckel: "L'unité sociale est la famille et non l'individu."—*Paul Bourget.*

M. Paul Bourget's later phase is more a *conclusion* than a *conversion.* Here and there throughout M. Bourget's writings there

are indications that he has not forgotten the Catholic faith of his childhood, and the attentive reader will realize that he was never duped by the brilliant cosmopolitan world be depicted so skillfully in his novels. Nor must it be forgotten that as far back as 1899 M. Bourget published "Le Disciple," a noble work, in which he expounded the thèse that the philosopher should be held responsible for the moral effect of his teaching. "Le Disciple" fell like a bombshell in a society which recognized no law but that of æsthetics, and it is proof of M. Bourget's sincerity that he should have risked his popularity by advocating a doctrine so antagonistic to the spirit of the time.

M. Bourget, having during twenty years maintained an attitude of analyst and consequently of searcher, finally concluded that man cannot live without laws strong enough to subdue the anarchy of his instincts and that the only law capable of such a miracle is Christianity. In the gradual crystallization of his convictions into a lucid whole there is no doubt that M. Bourget was considerably influenced by his visit to America, where the fine Catholic prelates he met during his stay much impressed him. Unfortunately, as we think, M. Bourget's religious development did not continue on the democratic lines the tone of "Outre-Mer" led his readers to expect. "L'année terrible" (1898) intervened, and one of the minor effects of *l'affaire Dreyfus* was that M. Bourget, perhaps in revolt against some unpatriotic theories advanced by socialistic leaders, became a convinced monarchist, an adherent of the school of Rivarol and Bonald, and of M. Charles Maurras, the brilliant founder of "L'Action Francaise." M. Bourget admits the autobiographical nature of certain traits in the early life of Robert Greslau in "Le Disciple," and this is completed by two of the chapters in "L'Etape:" that in which Jean Monneron relates to M. Ferrand the way in which he has been led to Catholicism and that in which we witness Jean Monneron's final acceptance of the faith in its entirety. It is certain that in these pages of penetrating beauty, lucidity and profound emotion the author reveals to us a personal religious experience. M. Bourget in his later phase has constituted himself the defender of the Christian family—as M. Barrès is the apostle of Provincialism—and in "L'Etape," "Un Divorce," "Le Tribun" and other works he has studied various points affecting the position of the family in the society of to-day. While the individual is ephemeral, the family constitutes the most powerful effort that man has conceived against oblivion, and in principle M. Bourget's doctrine is the same as that of M. Barrès, since in the "home," the centre of family traditions, lies the germ of that spirit of nationality which, as already urged, gives a sense of solidarity to the

individual and enables him to resist the disaggregating tendency of modern thought.

In "Marriage et l'Union Libre" (1904) M. Georges Fonsegrive lays stress on the way in which works of fiction—those of the Romantic as much if not more than those of the materialistic school—have furthered divorce by ignoring the possibility of conjugal love and by glorifying passion, which, it is suggested, should sweep all before it. It is therefore to be hoped that the literary reaction which has now set in will prove equally influential in checking the spread of divorce, which by attacking the indissolubility of marriage touches the foundation stone on which family life is built, since, as Auguste Comte has sagely said: "La seule idée de changement y provoque." It is certainly most encouraging that among M. Bourget's followers in this movement against divorce should be found M. Leon Daudet and M. Henri Bordeaux, writers eminently representative of their time. M. Leon Daudet, who has personal reasons for knowing that divorce is not the simple question it appears to legislators, in "Le Partage de l'Enfant" exposes the miseries of the child of divorced parents, and these are the significant words that he puts into the mouth of his hero:

"Je me repetais que seul le mariage indissoluble . . . parfumé d'eternité par un sacrement, garantit la destinée, humaine. . . . Il n'est pas douteux que mon avis soit partagé par tous ceux qui ont souffert du divorce, connu comme moi les affres de partage, la dissociation du sentiment familial. Le legislateur antichretun a fabriqué sans s'endouter une generation plus prête qu'aucune autre à l'empriente du dogme Catholique, cement et condition de la famille. Le vague reve des jeunes romantiques a pris chez mes contemporains cette forme précise: *des parents unis.* Tous, nouz esperons eperdument à la reconstitution du foyer."

So, too, in "Les Yeux qui s'ouvrent"—one of M. Bordeaux's finest works—the theme is the primordial importance of the family. All the arguments that can be invoked in favor of divorce are based on consideration of the parents as individuals and fall to the ground when the family is considered in its integrity and perpetuity, and in "Les Yeux qui s'ouvrent," as in his other works, M. Bordeaux inculcates the doctrine, continuously urged by the Church, that in marriage the child is the first consideration, not the happiness of the parents.

It is to be regretted that in "Un Divorce" M. Bourget did not pose the question in its full force and simplicity and show the grave difficulties arising in the case of divorce and remarriage, which do not arise in the case of the second marriage of a widow or widower. In "Un Divorce" the problem would have been the same

had Darras married a widow instead of a divorcee, as the real conflict is between the atheist husband and a wife drawn back to the abandoned faith of her youth and tortured by doubts as to the validity of her civil marriage and the question of the religious training of her child.

In "Le Tribun" and "L'Etape" M. Bourget illustrates the danger of modern individualistic theories, and with an impartiality which does him credit draws in Portal and Monneron, high-principled Socialists, who are blind to the significance of their teaching until this is put in practice in their own families and causes general demoralization. Portal, surnamed the "Tribune" from his eloquence, contends in absolute good faith that the family, instead of being a support to the individual, is the chief obstacle to his development. Hence all his political measures, on inheritance, divorce and monopoly of instruction, are aimed against family solidarity, which must, he believes, be destroyed before any of the present social evils can be remedied. Each individual, Portal also argues, is a unit in himself and is alone responsible for his acts, of which he bears the consequences, good or bad. The catastrophe is caused by the fact that his son Georges—as Monneron's son Antoine in a similar situation—interprets this last doctrine as "every man for himself," and in pursuit of his own *droit au bonheur* he procures money for his pleasures by dishonest means, to the stupefaction of his austerely virtuous father. Portal finally recognizes that it is his teaching that has indirectly caused the crime, and at the conclusion he comes to realize the truth that *la cellule sociale est la famille et non l'individu.*

Of "L'Etape" M. Bourget has said: "C'est ma pensée dans sa simplicité entière," and his subsequent works only develop the Catholic and Royalist convictions therein expressed. Even when we dissent from the author's social and political theories, we are obliged to admit that it is one of the chef d'œuvres of modern French fiction, written with a sincerity and nobility of purpose which entitle it to rank with "Le Disciple." The thèse of "L'Etape" is that social life must follow the laws which govern natural life, passing through each successive stage, and that any effort to accomplish at a stroke what should have been the gradual work of generations leads inevitably to disaster. M. Bourget illustrates his thèse by the tragedy of the Monneron family, caused by a too sudden change from a humble provincial home to the vortex of Parisian life. No one would wish to deny the difficulties attendant on any rapid rise of position, but we are chilled when we find that the author dockets men off into various well-defined compartments in a manner more suggestive of theories elaborated in

the study than of truths realized in the more illuminating workshop of life. It is instructive of M. Bourget's mentality—if discouraging to those among us who are keen on the back to the land movement—that in his social classification he apparently considers that the peasant, the tiller of the soil, occupies the very lowest stratum, and evidently regards it as a marked social advance for a peasant family to arrive at the position of small shopkeepers!

"Si elles etaient dignes parleur vertus," writes M. Bourget, "ces familles terriennes arrivaient à la petite bourgeoisie avec le temps. Puis de la petite bourgeoisie si elles continuaient à se fortifier elles montaient à la moyenne, à la haute, à la noblesse."

And with each ascent in the social scale the author seems naively to imagine there accrues a corresponding accession of higher morality! Had such a desirable state of things existed there never could have been any social conflict, as those "on top" would naturally have been incapable of tyranny or any other abuse of the powers intrusted to them. In reality history shows only too clearly that while some aristocratic traditions are good and ennoble man, others are evil and debase him. As no class has the monopoly of intelligence, no class has the monopoly of morality. How, indeed, could it be otherwise when, as we find on examination, Christianity is the root of all sound tradition, and hence the principles of moral beauty are common to all classes.

The social thèse of "L'Etape" naturally raised a tumult of discussion, and M. Bourget subsequently modified his sentiments and admitted—in reply, it is comforting to note, to the protest of an aristocrat, M. de Haussonville—àpropos of such cases as Guizot and Pasteur, that "le talent quand il est d'un certain degré echappe aux lois generales." M. Bourget's educational views are consistent with his general outlook. He approves of the widest possible extension of primary education, but would restrict rather than extend the limits of secondary education. In "L'Etape" the Union Tolstoi is a somewhat caricatured representation of popular educational centres. M. Bourget with characteristic courage asserts that the *ouvrier* is not a primitive being with latent forces, but a civilized being of mediocre species, who, in the vast majority of cases, has arrived at the highest development of which he is capable. M. Bourget believes that an unbridgeable chasm separates those who work with their brains from those who work with their hands and thoroughly disapproves of all efforts at the fusion of classes, which, in his opinion, only lowers the one without raising the other. He is particularly severe in the person of Abbé Chanut on the priests who dream of reconciling democracy and religion.

M. Bourget, then, to sum up, is anti-democratic. He has no hope

that a suitable government can be evolved out of a democracy and places all his hopes in a restoration of the monarchy. We have given this resumé of M. Bourget's views because, unfortunately as we think, these are the views of the influential Catholic party in France, not only of the old aristocrats, but also of many of the most illustrious recent converts to the Christian tradition: M. Jules Lemaitre, M. Paul Lœwengard, M. Leon Daudet, who as a pamphleteer wields a pen of such bitter sarcasm that he has been compared to Swift; M. Charles Maurras and all the energetic youth of the Action Francaise; M. Maurice Barrès as a Republican-Nationalist occupies a position by himself.

The ideal of these writers is a Catholic monarchy, and in mistaken loyalty they form a bodyguard to what has been graphically described as "le cadavre de la royauté." They vow their allegiance to an indissoluble union of throne and altar and continue the conservative policy of the last forty years, which cannot be said to have benefited the cause of the throne, and which has certainly brought continual and needless defeats on the Catholic party.

On the other hand, we have in France democratic Catholic writers who, while fully realizing all the faults of the present government, devote their energies to trying to create a republic more worthy of the name. This democratic party continues to fight its uphill way, attacked fiercely on the one hand by all the anti-clericals, who realize that these are their most redoubtable enemies, and on the other denounced as deserters, if not traitors, by most of the Catholic conservatives. In the lamentable spectacle of Catholic parties expending in fraternal conflicts the forces so badly wanted against the common enemy, we must only get what consolation we can out of the reflection that agitation is a sign of life and that the pages of history show that in every state where there was vigor there was also enmity and strife between men fighting for the same cause and honestly believing that they were working for the well-being of their country and their faith.

Among these democratic writers it is proposed here to deal specially with the work of "Yves Le Querdec" and that of two young Catholic writers, M. Jean Yole and M. Jean Nesmy, as the social ideas in their novels fall in with the scope of this paper. Foremost place must naturally be given to "Yves Le Querdec"—the pseudonym which M. Georges Fonsegrive, professor of philosophy at the Lycée Buffon, adopts in his novels—who in "Fils de l'Esprit" (1905) concluded the study of social conditions from a Catholic point of view, already treated in "Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne,"[1] "Lettres d'un Curé de Canton" and "Journal d'un Eveque."

[1] Couronné par l'Academie Française.

As "L'Etape" expounds the principles of Catholic conservatism in France, "Le Fils de l'Esprit" may be regarded as the exposition of Catholic democracy, and the high intellectual gifts and well-known religious fervor of the author give a special interest to the opinions embodied in the protagonist, Norbert de Péchanval. An ardent patriot and deeply religious, Norbert gradually loses confidence in the methods of the Catholic conservative party, to which he naturally belongs by birth and education. He realizes that the only vital principle in the party is opposition to the anti-clerical policy of the Government, and that, united to destroy, the conservatives are without any constructive policy of their own and appear to think that all the problems of life would be solved by the mere substitution of a monarchy for a republic. Norbert's estrangement is completed when he finds that the conservatives have no idea of educating the people to *choose* a monarchy, and that their hope is to be able to force this on the country. For, he reflects, while it is possible that a hazard of fortune may overthrow the Republic and place some victorious general or dashing pretender on the throne of France, it is quite certain that unless such a man possessed the justice of a St. Louis, united to the genius and determination of a Napoleon, his popularity would be shortlived, and at the end of a few years all would be back in the old chaotic condition.

Catholicism, which is a living vital force, has had the misfortune of being too intimately associated in France with a party not merely conservative, but reactionary, whose chiefs appear incapable of imagining a future which is not exactly similar to the past. These traditionalists lay great stress on the fact that France has always been Catholic *and* Royalist, forgetting that though they the privileged class regret the whole edifice of the *ancienne regime*, this had its faults and grave injustices, which pressed heavily on the middle and lower classes. No small part of the misfortunes of the Church in France is due to the close alliance which formerly existed between it and the monarchy, so that when the Revolution came the Church, which had shared in political power, was regarded by many as part of the old tyrannical system. To this prejudice is still due the easy victory of anti-clericals at elections when, *adopting the very words of the royalists*, they dwell on the insoluble union existing between Catholicism and the monarchy, making the first responsible for the faults of the latter, to the great injury of our Church, which is universal and eternal, suited to all governments as to all nations and all ages.

The eloquent voice of M. Jacques Piou has before now urged his co-religionists to believe that by social reform and by that alone will they be able to reconquer the people, and this is also the conviction of M. Georges Fonsegrive as voiced by Norbert de Pechan-

val in "Fils de l'Esprit." Failing a Catholic Social party, Norbert would prefer to see Catholics mingled with all parties in the *Chambre des Deputés*, sitting wherever their political views were best represented and uniting in natural accord whenever a law affecting religion presented itself. Norbert therefore severs his connection with the Catholic conservative party, convinced that its failure is due to the fact that it is not inspired by a vital principle which, rooted in the soil, unites and strengthens a nation, but rather that it is the expression of an antiquated aristocratic creed maintained by the fostering zeal of its exponents.

Under existing conditions Norbert believes that the individual Catholic will best help in the national work of regeneration by depending on personal influence alone: by living among the people, by helping them to get social reforms, by proving to them that there is a solidarity of interests between us and that we are affected by their prosperity and by their want. The confidence of the people would thus be regained, class enmities would be dispelled and the influence acquired by Catholics would necessarily further in the most efficacious manner possible the cause of religion. "Le Fils de l'Esprit" gives a complete picture of the social conditions of rural France at the present time. In it we see Norbert putting his theories into practice, trying to conciliate conservative enemies, attacking the various anti-clerical influences undermining the country, and from his defeats as from his victories Catholics of all countries can learn useful lessons.

In "Les Arrivants" (1910), by M. Jean Yole, we find the same democratic ideas. M. Yole divides rural populations, putting aside those who by birth or influence belong to the governing class, into *les gens à l'aise et les besogneux:* the comfortably off and those who are needy. The needy, as we shall see when we come to the question of charity, are well looked after, but, as M. Yole points out, *les arrivants,* or rising men—perhaps the most important section of a community—are in many places lost to the Catholic cause through the *intransigeance* of aristocrats, determined at all costs to maintain the class barriers of the *ancienne regime.* It would indeed seem that sometimes these conservative chiefs surround themselves with obsequious mediocrities in preference to accepting the valuable aid of rising men of talent who expect to be treated as social equals. Thus many of these *arrivants* who would have been only too glad to serve on the Catholic side drift into the ranks of our enemies because they find that they would be relegated to an inferior position in the conservative party. The old Marquis de Kerjoval is still representative of a considerable number of traditionalists who believe that perpetual failure is preferable to abating

an iota of class prejudice, and who decline to see any difference between a moderate republican candidate and a rabid anti-clerical, regarding all who are not "royalist and Catholic" as mere *canaille.* Of M. de Roydan, another conservative chief of much more reasonable views, Michel Renau, one of *les arrivants,* says:

"L'erreur de M. de Roydan, c'est d'allier en toute circonstance la cause royaliste à la cause religieuse. . . . Nous payons par la perte de nos libertés religieuses les essaies unfructuieux de nos chefs d'arborer le drapeau blanc. Nos legislateurs franc-maçon le comprennent et comme ils ont interet à ce que l'equivoque persiste, ils refusent avec un soin jaloux à tous les Catholiques l'epithète de republican."

By vigorous propaganda the anti-clericals, aided by the action of the conservatives, have finished by impressing their ideas on the peasants, who in many places would give the definition, "a republican is a man who does not go to Mass." One evil result of this antagonism between the Catholic conservative party and the Republic is that the anti-clericals are able to penalize Government officials who continue to practice their religion, and another is that when in rural districts people abandon the Royalist cause they almost necessarily—so closely are the two united—abandon the Catholic faith as well.

In "Les Arrivants," as in "Le Fils de l'Esprit," we find it suggested that in private as in public life class distinctions should be at an end, and the marriage between Jeanne de Roydan and Michel Renau symbolizes the breakdown of too exclusive social barriers. So, too, the keynote of the new Catholic spirit is struck by Jeanne de Roydan when, in reply to an old aristocrat who regrets that he did not live in the more heroic days of the Crusades, when there was something worth fighting for, she declares that each age has its own heroism, its own crusade to fight for God and humanity.

III.

L'aumone n'est qu'une des formes de la charité, la plus facile à faire—Le pays demande autre chose.—*Jean Yole.*

Il faut que nous entrions comme un boulet dans la masse incroyante, qu'on sache bien que c'est nous vivons, qui sommes l'avenir, la dernière reserve des energies.—*Emile Baumann.*

Dans chaque grande douleur accepté il y a un peu de la vraie Croix.—*Leon Daudet.*

These democratic writers urge the necessity of envisaging afresh the whole question of charity and point out that hitherto one of the great mistakes of Catholics has been to imagine that all social problems could be solved by almsgiving. M. de Roydan in "Les Arrivants" illustrates the very usual type of landowner who is

ever ready to give *charity,* but not *justice,* and the tragic thing is that he thinks to serve the cause of religion in maintaining the peasants on his land in a dependent position, looking to him for aid in sickness or misfortune, and therefore naturally obliged to lend an outwardly assentive mien to his political and religious exhortations. The days for such tutelage are passed, and almsgiving by its very nature can only affect the sick and the old. If, therefore, Catholicism is to remain a vital force in the world, it must, besides protecting the weak, apply itself to furthering the social reforms that the young and valiant members of the community are fighting for. The Church needs not weaklings, but strong soldiers, capable of radiating the faith around them, and many Catholics do not realize that just as dependence enfeebles the will, economic independence develops a sense of responsibility and is a valuable asset in character building. M. de Roydan would have better helped the religious cause he has so keenly at heart if instead of lavishing alms he had helped the tenants trying to help themselves, if he had augmented the wages of the peasants and made it possible for them to be self-supporting, if by the introduction of rural savings banks he had inculcated economy and protected them against the usurers, and, above all, if he had instituted those mutual insurance societies by which the poor, humiliated by always receiving, regain self-respect when they are made to feel that they in their turn are helping others. In too many cases almsgiving is found isolated, as it were, from the other precepts of Christian charity when it becomes little more than a gesture. In these books certain "philanthropic" persons of false piety and mechanical charity are mirrored, who seem to give with the tips of their fingers, so that those who receive feel that while "the well-filled purse is always open, the heart behind it is always closed," and the result is that the chasm between rich and poor is widened rather than bridged over.

M. Jean Nesmy, who is as democratic as M. Fonsegrive and M. Yole, is rapidly acquiring a prominent position among novelists in France, though little known in other countries. Each of M. Nesmy's works, it has been well said, is the act of a citizen, a patriot and a Christian. He is also an artist, and in his novels the characters, episodes and setting are in absolute harmony, so that we seem to be actual spectators of the scenes narrated.

In "Les Egarés" (Couronné par l'Academie des Sciences Morales et Politiques) M. Nesmy shows the dangers to which France is exposed by certain teachers whose three characteristics are: hostility to the Catholic religion, inclination towards Protestant individualism and indifference in matters of patriotism. Under fine-sounding

phrases of pretended humanitarianism they hide their egotistical desire to shirk the discipline and self-sacrifice which patriotism entails, and *neutralité patriotique* followed quickly on *neutralité religieuse*. Teachers have been found so scrupulous regarding individual liberty that they declared publicly they would not feel justified in speaking to pupils of duty, of conscience or of responsibility!

In "L'Ivraie" (Couronné par l'Academie Française), which deals with the tragedy consequent on the desertion of the country for the towns, M. Nesmy shows incidentally another way in which the modern teacher's idea of progress is likely to bring misfortune on France. In rural districts one would imagine that the chief aim of education would be to give the children knowledge that would be of use to them in their daily life, and by dwelling on the dignity and interest of agricultural life try and attach the more intelligent of the pupils to the soil and fill them with zeal to make two blades of grass grow where one had been before! Instead of that, we find —and the anomaly exists unfortunately in other countries besides France—that the education given is only suitable to prospective city clerks, while the tendency of teachers is to skim off the cream of country intelligence for the towns, with the result that countrysides need workers and city slums are overcrowded. In perfect good faith, as shown in "L'Ivraie," schoolmasters pursuing a disastrous ideal of individualism think to further the cause of progress when they encourage their best pupils to desert the land, to break away from all the sober, restraining traditions of rural life, and, worst of all, to despise the patient resignation of the peasant who accepts the bad seasons with the good, and in storm as in sunshine continues that unceasing labor of the earth on which the whole edifice of life may be said to rest.

"You are leaving us," the schoolmaster in "L'Ivraie" says to Pascalou, who already half *deraciné* by his military service, longs for what he imagines to be the gay, easy life of towns. "The news does not surprise me. I have long expected it. You are intelligent and active and sure to get on. I am glad to hear that you are going to seek your fortune in the town."

Thus encouraged, Pascalou naturally regards the warnings of the old curé as the futile fears of "a reactionary" and departs for the town. There he flatters himself his individual existence will henceforth be secure whatever be the misfortunes of others. Let the storm rage as it list, let the vine perish, let the corn be blighted and the whole countryside be plunged into poverty, it won't affect him snugly sheltered in the city, where there is always wine and bread to be had in shops. Pascalou, starting in this frame of mind,

comes naturally under the worst influences of the town, and the story tells his gradual fall into vice and dishonesty. M. Nesmy, whose talent is akin to that of Charles Dickens and to that of the Russian novelist, Nicholas Gogol, excels in his descriptions of the joys and tragedies of the poor, and one of his most touching creations is that of Pascalou's mother, a figure of sublime maternal tenderness.

In "Les Egarés" and "L'Ivraie" it is the problems of rural life that engage the author's attention, and among other things he points out that Catholic social workers would do well to devote some of the energy now concentrated on the reformation of the artisan in towns to the moral and physical well-being of the peasant in those country parishes which are still the most precious reservoirs of the Catholic faith.

In "La Lumière à la Maison" (1910) M. Nesmy's touch is equally sure in dealing with the evils prevalent in industrial centres. In the person of l'Abbé Herluison we are shown the moral regeneration that can be worked by real faith, even in a citadel of Socialism, where workers are enmeshed in all the horrors of contemporary materialism. Abbé Herluison realizes the fact that the ministry of the priest in France to-day is quite different from that of yesterday and that what the Church needs now is not anchorites, but missionaries. Experience has proved to him that when priests withdraw into the sanctuary they unwittingly play into the hands of their enemies, who endeavor to push religion from all participation in public life and hope by shutting the priest within the shadow and silence of the Church to deprive him of all social influence. Like the Abbé Firmen in "Fils de l'Esprit" and l'Abbé Raymond in "Les Arrivants," the Abbé Herluison has no political views, but, like them, he considers that the wise course is to try and do the best we can under existing conditions and make bad laws as little mischievous as possible. Nor while recognizing the evils of the present government, would he allow that there was any incompatibility between a republic and Catholicism, pointing to the progress of the Church in America as a proof to the contrary. When the old Marquis makes gloomy predictions as to the future of the Church under the Republic, the Abbé reminds him that the Third Republic started under the supreme control of the Catholic conservative party, who gradually lost the confidence of the country by their repeated efforts to restore the monarchy. Catholics are themselves, therefore, largely to blame for the fact that the Republic subsequently developed on lines antagonistic to them. Had they from the start given loyal assistance in constructing the Republic, the result would probably have been very different. In his efforts

to make Catholicism a vital force the Abbé Herluison combats unceasingly the mental inertia of those who do nothing but lament over the misfortunes of the present time and regard the future with trembling, thus losing all initiative towards social reform. To Abbé Herluison's way of thinking, "Etre religieux c'est relier et non pas désunir," and his mission was one of gentleness and conciliation. He believed that it was a priest's duty to aid all, good and bad alike, and that there was no creature so fallen as to be unworthy of love. What he preached from the altar he put in practice in his life, and the result was that the beauty of his soul little by little spread its influence through his humble parish and produced a renaissance of Catholicism.

It is remarkable that such a prominent part should be taken by priests in these books dealing with social reform, all advocating the hopeful doctrine that no parish is so bad that the moral and intellectual character of the people cannot be raised by a priest inspired by a true apostolic spirit. Besides the priests already mentioned, three others demand special notice. No reader of M. René Bazin's beautiful book, "Blé qui lève" will have forgotten the admirable Abbé Roubiaux and the consoling symbolism of the concluding handclasp between him and Gilbert Cloquet—cette chose ancienne et belle et necessaire: les mains de l'ouvrier melées à celles des prêtres. The Curé de Saint Just in M. Poizat's "Avila des Saints" is another valiant priest who actually creates a prosperous village around his once isolated church. Afterwards when anti-clerical agitators invade his peaceful hamlet and his flock fall from their allegiance, it is suggested to the curé that his life work has been wasted, but the old man never wavers, secure in his faith that all that concerns us is to sow the good seed, the result of the harvest not being our affair.

Above all others, however, stands the Curé X., who as the Curé de Saint-Julien[2] and later as the Curé de Saint-Maximen[3] is the protagonist who voices M. Georges Fonsegrive's schemes of social reform, which have doubtless been the source of inspiration of many of the younger writers we have named. The Curé X. considered that charity consisted in relieving suffering of all sorts, physical and spiritual, and that there were many other miseries besides that of needing bread. All that is just, he reflected, is necessarily pleasing to God, and it would be strange indeed if the Church were to ignore the sufferings of the poor, leaving to her adversaries the task of defending them. It is not because in Paradise all earthly wrongs will be made right that we should fold our hands

[2] "Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne" (Couronné par l'Academie Française).
[3] "Lettres d'un Curé de Canton."

here below and look on at these injustices. The Church preaches resignation to all inevitable suffering, but she must not seem in any way to uphold oppression or exploitation of the people's labor. Further, the Curé X. believed that prevention is better than cure, and besides relieving present suffering and want, he sought to root out their causes, and thus ameliorate the future. Curé X.'s progressive ideas bring him into great disfavor with the influential conservative Catholics of the neighborhood, and when he institutes *caisses de credit* to secure the poor against the tyranny of usurers and temperance societies to combat the other evil of alcoholism, he draws the fury of all the money-lenders and publicans upon himself. Attacked on all sides and with little evidence of any real good resulting from his labors, the Curé X. realizes the whole magnitude of the sacrifice required of him, but he never falters. He knows that it is not for him to think of what the consequences to himself may be; he is there for the salvation of his flock, a tool in the hand of God and *le fer ne doit pas avoir peur d'être froissé*, it is intended that it should wear out in the service of the Master.

The Curé X. dies a victim to his zeal, and it is his death that accomplishes the reformation he so longed for in his parish. "Yves Le Querdec" wishes, we infer, to emphasize the beneficial action of voluntary sacrifice. It is one thing to *say* that one would willingly give one's life for the people and another thing altogether to actually put this in practice, and, like the Curé X., expend one's life force in fighting the cause of the poor. The author further illustrates his belief in the radiating power of goodness by making one of the Curé X.'s disciples, Abbé Firmen, the reforming spirit of his later novel, "Le Fils de l'Esprit," where in his turn Abbé Firmen passes on to others the good seed he has received.

This belief in the efficacy of self-sacrifice preoccupies other writers, notably M. Emile Baumann, the theme of whose first novel, "L'Immolé" (Couronné par l'Academie Française), is that men may offer themselves as voluntary holocausts one for the other. "L'Immolé," a work of great originality and beauty of language, attracted widespread attention on its appearance in 1909, and the story of Daniel Rovere's struggles and final triumph is too well known to need repetition here. Some people have made it a matter of reproach to the author that a book inspired by such mystic fervor and dealing with the vicissitudes of a soul in search of perfection should also vibrate with powerful human passion, and it is certain that the vivid imagery of some of the scenes would make it difficult to present the book in an English form. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the object of the writer is to represent the eternal conflict between Christian sentiments and the desires of

the flesh and to trace the gradual triumph of the higher aspirations of the soul over the baser instincts. If in depicting Daniel Rovere's falling away from grace the force of these instincts had been veiled, his subsequent self-disgust and remorse, which the author has so eloquently described, would be incomprehensible. Catholic fiction contains few more illuminating pages than those in which M. Baumann has depicted the night of anguish in which Daniel Rovere fought out the final struggle between his passions and his religious belief. He realizes that for him salvation is only to be found in a complete immolation, and in a free gift of himself, absolute and beyond recall, he at last gains dominion over his passions and a sense of peace that he had never known before. It is as though a veil had been drawn from before his eyes, and the author's own words best describe the wonderful vision he has of the vast communion of the Catholic Church and the universal law of sacrifice:

"Le sacrifice est la vie du monde, depuis l'herbe immolé sans le savoir à l'agneau qui broute, jus qu'à l'Homme-Dieu qui a renové, qui renove la terre par le Sang des Justes des Martyrs, et par le Sien. . . . S'immoler, ah! c'etait Dien la loi unique, la loi implacable et douce. Dans cette nuit amère, qui decherait pour lui le rideau des apparences, il decouvrit mieux qu' à nulle heure de son passé, l'immensité des immolations silencieuses. Et ces holocausts etaient beaux, il etaient justes ils etaient saints; car ou bien la souffrance avait une valeur infinie de redemption et de bonté ou bien le monde ressemblait à une gehenne absurde, à un abattoir nauseabond. Il suivait depuis les racines de l'ordre, crée, le sacrifice permanent des faibles. Seulement les pierres, les arbres, les bêtes subissaient sans pouvoir murmurer cette alternance terrifiante et divine. Lui au contraire, il se savait libre de l'accepter dans l'amour ou de blasphemer contre elle, et il l'acceptait en communion avec le Christ. Le Christ seul etait la victime parfaite, parce qu'il a pleinement voulu l'être."

"L'Immolé" is perhaps not a book for *la jeune fille*, but all who know something of life cannot fail to be fortified by a work which really makes us feel the force of Catholicism in controlling passions and stimulating for good. At the conclusion of "L'Immolé" Daniel Rovere is seriously injured in trying to prevent an anti-clerical mob from wrecking a church. Offering himself in voluntary sacrifice, he stands barring with his outstretched arms the entrance to the sanctuary, so that to many of the attackers he suddenly appears to be a living symbol of the Cross, and M. Baumann's conclusion suggests the moral already given by "Yves Le Querdec" in "Lettres d'un Curé," that self-immolation is often fruitful in good works.

In conclusion, another novel inspired by the belief in the value of accepted suffering must be mentioned.

"La Lutte," by M. Leon Daudet, with the sub-title "Le Roman d'un Guerison," is a painful, and sometimes unpleasant, work relating a man's gradual ascent from materialism to Catholicism. The hero, whose case is diagnosed for us, is a typical Parisian, accustomed to every form of self-indulgence until, attacked by symptoms of tuberculosis, he suddenly becomes isolated from his fellows and told that on himself and on his own powers of self-discipline and energy depend his recovery. From childhood surrounded with the gayety and sociability of cities, he now for the first time in his life is alone, and thrown thus upon his own resources, finds that he has no firm principle that he can hold by. Acting on the evil counsel of one of his friends, he starts taking opium to help him through his fits of depression, and, falling under its influence, has two enemies to combat instead of one. In the early days of his malady he is much astonished when one of the specialists he visits asks whether he is *croyant,* and on his giving a reply in the negative, hardly understands the doctor's remark that this is a pity, as he has often noticed that in such cases believers resist better—*"C'est un escalier à remonter et ils ont une rampe."*

Afterwards he comes to understand that while skepticism predisposes to decay, faith puts man in touch with the Infinite and enables him to appeal to and be sustained by superior forces. In his enforced isolation he sees the folly of his past life, lived liked a sleepwalker, and "La Lutte" relates his ascent and final cure—the spiritual hygiene of the soul aiding the physical hygiene of the body—first of the opium habit and then, in courageous acceptance of suffering, the healing of his lungs. He looks back without regret upon his illness, which has revealed to him those higher truths without a knowledge of which "man is but a talking animal" and which has given him that comprehension of the miraculous which enables him to contemplate undismayed the world of stars. As the old monk at the monastery where he has completed his cure says to him at parting: "Your two years of agony have been profitable to you, my son! In place of the pagan that you were, they have substituted a Christian. In all great suffering borne with resignation there is a little of the True Cross."

A. MacMahon.

London, England.

WERE THE "ARTICLES ORGANIQUES" PART OF THE CONCORDAT OF 1801?

THERE are very few people of to-day who do not know that there have been religious troubles in France for many years past. Not so many, however, know precisely how it was that these troubles came about. Most people would be surprised to hear that the trouble arose about an agreement made between France and the Holy See as far back as 1801. When, in 1905, the Rouvier Ministry broke up this compact by decreeing the separation of Church and State, the reason given for the action was that the rupture was forced upon France by the simple fact that the Pope refused to recognize the obligations imposed on him by the Concordat. To this the Vatican immediately replied: "With the obligations imposed on us by the Concordat we have always complied. But the obligations which you wish us to carry out are not contained in the Concordat; they are contained in the Articles Organiques. To any obligation arising from this source we are, of course, in no way bound, since these articles were never agreed to by the Holy See or its representatives, nor did they form any part of the Concordat of 1801."

We do not assert that every single one of the questions at issue between France and the Holy See in the beginning of the present century was concerned with the Articles Organiques. The two main disputes were: Firstly, Did the Pope possess the right to refuse canonical institution to any particular candidate whom the French Government nominated to a bishopric? This question does not come within the scope of the present article, since it touches an article of the Concordat, or rather the interpretation of an article. The second point at issue, however, namely, whether the Pope possessed the right to summon any of the French Bishops to Rome without any permission from the Government, is the one that concerns us now. For there is no question of this in the Concordat, but there is in the Articles Organiques. That Pope Pius X. violated this article is certain, that the French Government denounced him for doing so is equally true, and that this action of the Pope was one of the chief arguments used in favor of the Law of Separation is a fact known to all who followed the proceedings in the French Parliament.

When, therefore, we inquire whether the Articles Organiques formed part of the Concordat between France and the Holy See, we are not plunging into an abstruse historical question, the solution of which is of no great value to-day. We are really asking whether

the French Government or Pope Pius X. is to be held responsible for the separation of Church and State in France. For if the Articles Organiques were part of the Concordat, there is no denying that the twentieth article was openly violated by Pius X. when, on the 2d of July, 1904, he summoned the Bishop of Laval to appear in Rome within fifteen days, making no provision whatsoever in case the Government should refuse him permission to leave his diocese. If, on the other hand, the Articles Organiques formed no part of the Concordat, then it must be admitted that at least one-half of the arguments brought forward by French politicians against the Church may be regarded as worthless. Whether the Concordat and the Articles Organiques were one and the same treaty is, therefore, the important question we purpose solving in this article.

Every one possessed of the most elementary knowledge of French history knows quite well that in the beginning of the last century religious affairs were not in a flourishing condition in France. The Revolution, it is true, was at an end, anarchy was crushed, but its devastating tracks still remained. The priests had been slain, the churches burned, the monasteries and convents turned into barracks. France may be said to have entered upon an entirely new phase of existence, in which its past was entirely forgotten. Under such circumstances a new Concordat became a necessity, for Napoleon, to give him his due, never wished to destroy religion. On the contrary, he was inclined to protect and foster it, provided, of course, that the Church never in any way dared to interfere with him.

By the mutual desire, therefore, of Pope Pius VII. and Napoleon a conference was held at Paris in 1801 for the purpose of determining the relations between Church and State in the new Empire. The drawing up of a Concordat is no easy task, for concordats invariably imply a felt divergency between the two contracting parties, neither of which is inclined to give way in any detail to the other. Still, in the present case things ran smoothly enough. There was no serious dissension between the representatives of the two powers, and as early as July the negotiations were completed, a treaty was drawn up and signed by Consalvi, Corinthi and Caselli on behalf of the Pope and by Jerome Bonaparte, Cretet and Bernier on behalf of the Emperor Napoleon.

Glancing over the seventeen articles of the Concordat, it may be said that on the whole the Church fared well, the different articles giving her fairly free scope to develop her divine mission and imposing on her no very offensive obligations. They might, of course, have been better, but the troubled state of France at the time had to be taken into consideration, and Pope Pius was doubt-

less not without hope that when things had settled down any causes of friction might, by a little mutual good will, be eliminated. But even as it stood the Concordat was a satisfactory treaty, containing nothing whatsoever contrary to the faith or discipline of the Catholic Church.

To one man, however—a very powerful man in France at the time—the satisfactory terms obtained by the Papal representatives occasioned great wrath. This was the infamous renegade, M. de Talleyrand. No sooner did he become acquainted with the terms of the Concordat than he immediately proceeded to draw up a code of articles which completely nullified the advantages gained by the Church. These articles were first known by the name of the Arrêté d'Organization, but later on they came to be called the Articles Organiques, the name by which they are always known now.

There is no denying the fact that when the Concordat received the ratification of the French Legislative Assembly the original compact and the Articles Organiques were presented together, just as though they were one and the same treaty. But we must bear in mind the fact that the Concordat was drawn up and signed in July, 1801, but was not presented to the Legislative Assembly till April, 1802, and during the nine months that elapsed between these two dates the busy brain of Talleyrand could have accomplished much. The question to be solved is therefore, "Were the Articles Organiques drawn up during this time, and in consequence entirely unconnected with the Concordat and unknown to the Papal representatives?"

The answer to this question may be drawn from two sources—from theology and from history. We enter on the theological argument first, for though it is of itself more convincing than any historical proof, it is an argument which will have little weight with non-Catholics. For it presupposes uniformity and consistency on the part of the Church—suppositions which our separated brethren are not always willing to concede. In their opinion, the Church is consistent in nothing but inconsistency, and hence to tell them that Pius X. teaches a certain doctrine by no means proves to them that Pius VII. did not teach the very opposite. Consequently, the theological argument, though convincing to Catholics, will convince them only, but we will afterwards bring forward the stern facts of history to prove our case to the most incredulous.

Nobody denies for a second that in difficult circumstances the Pope would be willing to concede much to a lay power; but, on the other hand, every Catholic knows that there is a limit beyond which the Pope would not or could not yield. Beyond all doubt, this limit has been more than once exceeded in the Articles Organiques.

The very first of the articles furnishes us with such an example. It runs as follows: "No bull, brief, rescript, mandate, provision or other document coming from the Roman Court, even though it only concern particular individuals, can be received, promulgated, published or otherwise enforced without the permission of the Government."

It is impossible to conceive that to such an article in that form the Papal representatives could ever have agreed. For any one can see what precisely it means. In the event of any friction between Church and State, the Pope would have to go to the Government and ask its permission to make his views known to the faithful. Let us take an example from what actually did occur later. The Government ordered for use in the schools books which were condemned by the Congregation of the Index. In such an emergency, then, the Pope, or his Legate, would have been obliged to go to one of the public officials and put him the question: "May I please tell the Bishops that they must strictly forbid the children to read the books which the Government has ordered to be used in the schools?" We can quite well imagine what the answer would be.

The third article forbids the publication in France of the decrees of general councils "until the Government shall have examined their form and their conformity with the laws, rights and liberties of the French Republic." If, therefore, the French Government chose to hold, as it does hold to-day, that matrimony, for example, is a thing entirely under their control, no Pope or general council should dare to tell the Catholics of France that the Church regards as nothing of the kind, but as one of the seven sacraments, and as such under her sole control.

But bad as are these articles, it can at least be held that they do not absolutely and necessarily run counter to faith. They certainly place the Church beneath the heel of the State, and for our part we do not believe that any Pontiff would ever consent to them. Still worse, however, was to come. The twenty-fourth article is of such importance that we give it in full:

"Those who shall be selected to teach in the seminaries shall affix their names to the declaration made by the clergy of France in 1682 and published by edict the same year; they shall undertake to teach the doctrine which is contained in that declaration, and the Bishops shall send a formal notification of this undertaking to the Councillor of State, in charge of all matters concerning public worship."

It would be too long a task to enter into a full history of the declaration referred to. It consisted of what are known as the

"Four Articles" and was the offshoot of a controversy between Pope Innocent XI. and King Louis XIV. Though not actually containing heresy as they stand, they unquestionably lead to it when pushed to their legitimate conclusion. For the whole scope of these four articles was to reduce the Papal authority to zero and in its place to substitute the authority of the King. The four articles, therefore, knocked into one might be written thus: "Whenever the Pope and the King quarrel, whether the question at issue be purely religious, purely political or containing an element of both, the King is invariably right, the Pope invariably wrong." Such was the doctrine which every ecclesiastical professor in France undertook to inculcate into the future clergy of the country, according to the Articles Organiques. And to such an article, we are told, three Papal representatives—one of them Cardinal Consalvi—gave their assent.

But even all this pales into insignificance when we read the fifty-fourth article, which runs as follows:

"They (the priests) will only give the nuptial blessing to those who shall prove in right and legal form that they have contracted marriage before the civil authority."

It must be admitted that in this article Talleyrand overdid it. To hold that the Pope, through his ambassadors, sanctioned the fifty-fourth of the Articles Organiques is so utterly absurd that it is almost surprising that this article was ever put in. For it is merely the expression of a veteran heresy which has cropped up over and over again and has as often been condemned by the Church. The heresy is that the sacrament of matrimony consists in the blessing given by the priest. This is directly contrary to the doctrine of the Church, which is that the sacrament and the blessing are two not merely distinct, but even separable things, since the sacrament consists in the contract between the two parties, which contract can, and frequently is, made without the conferring of any blessing. Now marriage in the article we have quoted evidently means the matrimonial contract, in which precisely consists the sacrament according to the teaching of the Church. And this was to be performed not before an ecclesiastic, but before a representative of the civil authority. French politicians, therefore, would have us to believe that Pope Pius VII. either held the sacrament of matrimony to consist in the nuptial blessing, or else admitted that over one of the sacraments the State and not the Church had control. If the Pope admitted the first hypothesis, he ran directly counter to the Council of Trent, which admitted the sacramental character of clandestine marriages contracted up to that time, for in clandestine marriages no blessing at all was given. If he admitted

the second, his teaching was diametrically opposed to what every other Pope, before and after him, has laid down, and truly the Articles Organiques of Pius VII. put matrimony on a very different footing from the "Ne Temere" of Pius X. How many will believe that a man of the highest order of ability like Consalvi walked blindly into this ridiculous heretical dilemma?

Such is the substance of what may be called the theological argument against the Articles Organiques. We do not for a second mean to assert that the articles we have commented on are the only ones to which offense could be taken. But they are perhaps the most offensive, and they are quite sufficient to prove to all Catholics—without any appeal to history—that at least some of these articles could not by any possibility have been sanctioned by the Holy See.

But when we open up the pages of history and inspect its stubborn facts, what a glorious vindication of the Holy See we find; what a wholesale condemnation of the French Government of to-day.

At the very outset we have what lawyers would call a prima facie argument against the genuinity—as we will call it—of the Articles Organiques. To the seventeen articles of the Concordat are affixed six names, three representing the Pope and three the Emperor; to the Articles Organiques are affixed no names at all. How does this happen? Men do not usually sign their names when they are halfway through a letter, and it is difficult to understand how those six learned diplomats came to affix their signatures at the end of the seventeenth article and then resumed their places and compiled seventy-seven more. Nor is this the only irregularity that can be noticed. From the beginning to the end of the Concordat there is not a single word of French, the language throughout being Latin; from the first to the seventy-seventh of the Articles Organiques not a single Latin word or phrase is used. This may not, indeed, be a convincing proof that the two were not drawn up by the same parties, but it certainly is a little fact which requires some explanation, and it has never received it.

Fortunately, history supplies us with more undeniable reasons for impugning the genuinity of the Articles Organiques. There was, it is true, no immediate uproar and protest against them after the signing of the Concordat, for the simple reason that they did not exist at the time. When exactly they were drawn up and by whom no one can say with absolute certainty. It is very probable that they were drawn up between July, 1801, and April, 1802, and the credit of drafting them is usually given to Talleyrand.

One thing is quite certain, that Pope Pius VII., according to his own clear words, heard or knew nothing about them till they were

publicly sanctioned and promulgated in April, 1802. At the very next Consistorial, held on the 24th of May, the Pontiff, while expressing his joy at the successful conclusion to the negotiations between the Holy See and France, disclaimed all knowledge of the Articles Organiques, against some of which he strongly protested. "We notice," said His Holiness, "that, together with our compact, there has been promulgated also a large number of other articles of which we had no knowledge whatsoever. We, in accordance with the traditions of our predecessors, can only hope that opportune and necessary changes will be made in them. We shall exert our whole influence with the First Consul to obtain this from his sense of religion. We have good reason to hope that we shall succeed, both from the character of the First Consul himself, as well as from that of the French nation, as full of wisdom and penetration."

We may remark that the Pope's words, "opportune and necessary changes," describe exactly the Vatican's attitude to the Articles Organiques. To some of them no objection could be taken; more could be rendered acceptable by clear explanation and the removal of some ambiguous phrases; others should be absolutely and entirely struck out.

In the meanwhile the articles were subjected to careful consideration in Rome, as a result of which a strong protest was dispatched, on the 18th of August, by Cardinal Caprara both to M. de Talleyrand and M. Portalis, the Councillor of State. In the opening passages of his letter the Cardinal expresses himself thus:

"I have been instructed to protest against that part of the law of 1801 which is known by the name of the Articles Organiques. I fulfill this duty with the greatest confidence, since I rely upon the good will of the Government and upon its sincere attachment to the true principles of religion. The character which is given to these articles would lead one at first to suppose that they are nothing but a natural consequence and merely an explanation of the Concordat. Nevertheless, it is true that they have not been drawn up in concert with the Holy See, that they have a much wider range than the Concordat and that they establish in France a code of ecclesiastical laws without the concurrence of the Holy See. How could His Holiness accept such a thing without having been invited even to examine it?"

Nor was the drawing of a clear distinction between the Concordat and the Articles Organiques a thing confined to the Vatican. Public opinion in France was just as firmly convinced that the two codes were entirely unconnected. This we know from a letter which Cardinal Fesch, the Papal Legate at Paris, wrote to Cardinal Consalvi on the 26th of May, 1802. In this letter the Legate says:

"With regard to the Articles Organiques, I am glad to be able to assure you that every one is convinced that they have not the slightest relation to the Concordat and that they have been drawn up without the express or tacit consent of the Holy See or its ministers, or still less of myself. For I indeed have lost no opportunity of breaking the bonds wherever these articles fetter either the Church or its ministers."

When the Articles Organiques were for the first time officially presented at the Vatican by M. Cacault, the Ambassador to the Holy See, the ecclesiastical authorities demanded an explanation of their being added to the Concordat. The explanation which he gave M. Cacault himself communicated later to Talleyrand:

"As to the Articles Organiques," wrote the Ambassador, "I have been obliged to explain that they have not been published as though drawn up in agreement with the Pope; that they were the work of the Government, which possesses the right to make them and which uses its right in this manner through regard for our laws."

That the French Government possesses the right to legislate for its subjects no one will deny, but that it possesses a right to add its own clauses to a treaty with another power and take it for granted that the other power, without being consulted,. will agree to them, is not quite so easy to see.

In his reply to the protest of Cardinal Caprara, which we have already quoted, M. Portalis flatly gives the lie to those who assert that the Concordat and the Articles Organiques were drawn up by the same parties. For in the course of his letter the Councillor of State says:

"I am fully aware that the Articles Organiques are the work of the civil power alone. I admit that, though the Holy See has been one of the contracting parties in the Concordat, it has had nothing at all to do with the Articles Organiques. But on this point there cannot be any misunderstanding, for the Pope, or rather his representatives, have signed the Concordat, but their names are not affixed to the Articles Organiques. The Concordat is a treaty, the Articles Organiques are a law; it is impossible to confound objects which bear no resemblance to each other."

We would wish indeed that the words of M. Portalis had proved true. Unfortunately, complications and misunderstandings did arise later on, and the violation of one of the Articles Organiques by the Pope was one of the chief reasons given for breaking up the Concordat.

A quite unforeseen event brought forth an expression of opinion on the point from Talleyrand himself. Preparations were going on at the time for the coronation of Napoleon as Emperor at Notre

Dame, which ceremony was to be performed by the Pope. As is usual on such occasions, an oath was drawn up for the Emperor to take, which oath was nothing but a brief outline of the Constitution, which the Emperor pledged himself to defend. With regard to religious matters, the oath to be submitted to Napoleon obliged him "to defend the Concordat and the laws of the Concordat." Under the circumstances the Pope could not consent to crown Napoleon until he had received a definite guarantee that the Articles Organiques were not what was meant by "the laws of the Concordat." Cardinal Caprara therefore wrote to Talleyrand informing him that Napoleon's wish could not be complied with until these ambiguous words were explained. If by the laws of the Concordat, wrote the Cardinal, were meant the Articles Organiques, the Pope could not in conscience be present while such an oath was taken.

On the 18th of July Talleyrand replied, and nothing could be more explicit than his words about the Articles Organiques. "The laws of the Concordat," he said, "are essentially the Concordat itself. The Concordat is the expressed will of the two contracting parties. The organic laws, on the contrary, are but a line of action adopted by one of the two parties. This can be changed and bettered according to circumstances. These two things cannot, therefore, be justly comprised in the same expressions. The words 'the laws of the Concordat' do not for a second imply a piling together of the Concordat and the organic laws."

Talleyrand's reply was immediately communicated to Cardinal Consalvi, who in turn made it known to the Pope. The good impression created at the Vatican by Talleyrand's words and the hopes drawn from them that the Articles Organiques would be knocked into an acceptable form were set forth by Cardinal Consalvi in a further letter to Cardinal Fesch. The letter ends thus: "The concluding portion of the declaration not only assures His Holiness that the organic laws are not comprised in the words 'the laws of the Concordat,' but it leads him to entertain high hopes of obtaining from His Imperial Majesty that change and amelioration which since the moment of their publication the Holy Father has implored from the devotion and the wisdom of His Majesty."

To this heap of historical proof we will add but one more document; not that it is a bit more conclusive than many others we have cited, but because it was drawn up when Napoleon was crushed and may be said to represent the minds of the rulers who governed France for the first half of the last century. This is the third article of the new code of laws, drawn up in 1817, after the restoration of the Bourbons, which runs as follows:

"The Articles Organiques, which have been drawn up without the knowledge of His Holiness and promulgated, without any assent on his part, on the 8th of April, 1802, at the same time as the Concordat, are abrogated in whatsoever they are contrary to the doctrine and the laws of the Church."

From a perusal of these documents one thing is quite evident, that it is a historical absurdity to say that the Holy See was bound in any way by the obligations of the Articles Organiques.

We must now affect a rapid transformation from the days of Napoleon down to the opening years of the present century. Some troubles had arisen in the Diocese of Laval, as a result of which the Bishop of that diocese was, by order of the Pope, summoned to Rome. The command was sent by Cardinal Merry del Val to Monsignor Lorenzelli, the Apostolic Nuncio at Paris, and by him transmitted to the Bishop. In executing this command the Nuncio violated the twentieth of the Articles Organiques, which forbade a Bishop to leave his diocese without the permission of the Government. Of this the Vatican took not the slightest notice. But not so the French Government. On the 19th of July the Chargé d'Affaires at Rome officially protested against this breach of the Concordat, as he regarded it.

"In summoning to Rome," he wrote, "directly and without the knowledge of the Government, a Bishop, who in his capacity of administrator of a diocese is subject to the Minister of Worship, the Holy See ignores the rights of the power with which it has signed the Concordat."

In his reply to this protest the Cardinal Secretary of State made it quite clear that the grievance brought forward by the Government was entirely imaginary, since the article violated was not one of the bilateral Concordat, but of the unilateral Articles Organiques. Ten days later France broke off diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

The question of who was right and who was wrong, therefore, depends to a great extent on whether the Holy See was bound to the obligations of the Articles Organiques. And that these articles never received the approval or tacit consent of the Vatican has, we think, been abundantly proved in this article.

W. J. Hegarty.

Exeter, England.

THE LIVING WAGE—AN ENGLISH VIEW.

DURING the last few years a great change has been passing over the face of Economic Science. It is not merely that it has made great strides. It is not merely that, as in the case of other Sciences, such as Chemistry, it has abandoned hypotheses which, containing a partial truth, did useful service until a fuller expression of that truth became possible. This science has undergone a revolution. It has harked back to the past in the recognition of the fact that it is impossible for the questions of the production, consumption and distribution of wealth to be dealt with adequately without regard to the human will—without respect for ethical considerations. It is sometimes urged that it is no part of the function of economics to suggest lines of action. Still the science is based on certain assumptions as to the probable action of individuals, and if ethical considerations are omitted, the result is likely to be misleading. If and when self-interest prevails, certain results follow and these results are coördinated in the science. But if altruistic motives form the basis of conduct, we get an entirely different set of results, and these must be taken cognizance of in modern developments of economics.

In no department of economics is this of more vital and practical importance than in that which relates to wages, and it may be useful for our purpose briefly to trace the history of economic thought during the last century on this most important question.

Starting with the theory of the "wages fund" which was enunciated by Adam Smith and developed by Malthus and John Stuart Mill, wages were looked on for many years as depending entirely at any given time on the number of wage-earners. From the hypothesis that a certain amount of capital only was available for the payment of wages grew the idea that any increase in the population must necessarily lower the rate of wages and that a rise could only be brought about by a falling off in the population. This, then, was the assumption underlying the dangerous proposals put forward by Malthus and his followers on the subject of the limitation of the birth-rate. Backed as this theory was by the authority of J. S. Mill, it held the ground for many years. An account of the first attack on it was given by Goschen in his Presidential Address before the British Association in 1893. He said: "I still retain vivid recollections of the first revolt against the doctrines of Mill, whose influence in this department of human thought it would be impossible to exaggerate. Mill was then in the plenitude of his unquestioned authority. Youthful audacity was then, as now, skeptical in many directions, but to doubt or assail the doctrines of

Mill was the anathema maranatha, the unpardonable heresy of those my student days. One exception, however, there was to this submission to authority. There was one amongst us who attacked Mill's cardinal position. We mocked at our friend. We used to declare that this bold assailant dealt only in verbal puzzles, but he was very persistent when he could get us to listen. Still he made no way. The iconoclast was F. D. Longe, who may be reckoned as ultimately the first successful assailant of "Mill's Wage Fund theory." Longe brought out a pamphlet in 1866 in which he argued that there was a "fair" wage and an "unfair" wage, and that the rate was not mechanically fixed, but depended on the produce. The final blow to the theory of the wages fund was given by F. A. Walker in his classical treatise on the "Wages Question," published in 1876. He developed the new view that there was no necessary relation between capital and wages, but that the latter were really derived from the product of present industry, though they might for convenience be advanced out of capital. He looked on the laborer as the "residual claimant to the product of industry" after deductions for rent, interest and profit had been made. He does not seem, however, to have recognized any question of just wages, though he admitted what he called "necessary wages"—the minimum below which wages could not fall without reducing the supply of labor, and thus inducing an opposite tendency—namely, a rise in wages. Thus he tells us: "It is not meant that the employer is bound either by equitable or by economical considerations to pay the laborer in the immediate instance enough to support life in himself and family. The employer will, in general, pay only such wages as the anticipated value of the product will allow him to get back from the purchaser with his own proper profits thereon. If in a peculiar condition of industry he consents for a time to give up his own profits, or even to produce at a sacrifice, it is with reference to his own interest in keeping his laboring force or his customers together in the expectation that a turn in affairs will enable him to make himself good for the temporary loss. If he pays more than is consistent with this object, *or if he pays anything from any other view than his own interest,* what he thus pays is not wages, but alms disguised as wages."[1]

Thus Walker assumes that motives other than self-interest can have no part in production.

Now, this seems a strange thing. If we take the profession, say, of medicine, we expect a doctor to be actuated by motives other than self-interest. He must indeed secure a living by his work, but if his chief concern is the heaping up of wealth rather

[1] "The Wages Question," F. A. Walker, page 109.

than the relief of suffering and prevention of disease, we should look on him as unfaithful to his calling. In his case we concede a motive other than self-interest, and we do not say he is giving alms to his patients because he gives them a devoted service which no money can buy. Again, in the case of an artist we do not expect self-interest to be the chief motive in production. Indeed, we are certain that the highest work cannot be produced, the artist cannot give us of his best, under this stimulus. He must be free to work for art's sake.

Yet in the production of ordinary goods it is almost universally assumed that the sole motive of the producer is to make a profit. Why must it be supposed that such a gulf exists between the moral equipment of, say, a lecturer—whose principal concern is not supposed to be his fee—and a manufacturer of any sort of material goods?

Recall George Eliot's poem in which Naldo, the painter, asks Stradivarius to tell him his motive in making violins:

> "Perhaps thou hast some pleasant vice to feed
> The love of louis d'ors in heaps of four,
> Each violin a heap—I've nought to blame.
> My vices waste such heaps." Antonio then:
> "I like the gold—well, yes, but not for meals.
> And as my stomach, so my eye and hand
> And inward sense that works along with both
> Have hunger that can never feed on coin.
> . . . . . .
> 'Tis rare delight: I would not change my skill
> To be the Emperor with bungling hands
> And lose my work, which comes as natural
> As self as waking."

Why cannot it be conceded that love of art or love of humanity may enter into the motives of the ordinary producer? If people were educated to the idea that in any line of life one's own interests should not come before those of others, they would not look on this as an absurd position to take up. Of course, where the things to be produced were merely reprehensible luxuries or the outcome of ignoble desires, such motives on the part of the producer would be inadmissible. Enlightened public opinion must be trusted to put a check on the production of such commodities even if the demand exists.

It is constantly said that self-interest is the necessary stimulus to induce men to put out their best efforts, to risk their capital and so on, and an argument commonly used against the nationalization of the means of production is that it would destroy personal incentive to work. It is true that Socialism makes a great demand on altruistic motives, but this is its strength rather than its weakness.

Yet setting aside the question of Socialism, why not allow the possibility of self-regarding motives being subordinated to other-

regarding motives in the process of production? One revolts from the idea that all the delightful conveniences of life, such as tables and chairs and bookcases, were made not at all for the pleasure of satisfying those who enjoy their use, but solely for the sake of profit. One refuses to picture to oneself the want of imagination of a manufacturer of children's toys, who sees not the outstretched hands and sparkling eyes of the little ones, but some miserable gain that he may acquire. One would hardly dare to make a profit on such things, lest the children should lose a joy which was their right.

But the mutual rights and duties of producer and consumer are not now to be considered, but those of employer and employed. The question of motive, however, is equally in point. If the producer's motive is self-interest, he is not primarily concerned with the payment of a living wage. Indeed, Walker tells us that "in the vast majority of cases the wages which employers pay their workmen are governed by the price at which they may fairly expect to sell the product, and this whether the workmen and their families can live thereon or not."[2] And because men have grown up so largely with the idea that their business is a matter of procuring wealth for themselves rather than a means of serving the community, wages have in many cases fallen to a bare subsistence level or even lower, and we have seen the result in ill health, misery and vice. It is not realized forcibly enough that for many a woman living under the worst conditions of labor in the East End of London—yes, and in the West, within a stone's throw of homes of luxury—the only alternative to degradation is heroism. But not having the right to demand heroism from the ordinary woman, the duty arises of seeing that the conditions of an honest existence are provided for her.

Professor Cairnes has pointed out that there are in society a certain number of what he calls "non-competing groups" of workers. Thus there are (1) the unskilled laborer, (2) the responsible, though unspecialized laborer, such as the miner, the tram conductor, etc., (3) the skilled workman, (4) the class including clerks, small tradespeople, etc., (5) the class consisting of professional and business men.

The problem of the living wage concerns the first group alone, and of these Professor Taussig, of Harvard University, writes thus in his recently published "Principles of Economics": "A rate of pay for common laborers much lower than that for other laborers is assumed by most people to be part of the order of nature. But it is by no means a matter of course, and it is very much a matter

[2] "The Wages Question," F. A. Walker, page 110.

for regret. Freedom in the choice of occupations is one of the most important conditions of happiness, and the traditional position of the common laborer is due to the absence of such freedom. The disparities in earnings and in social position, of which this is the most glaring, are not consistent with the ideals that are dominating the civilized world. They are, most of all, inconsistent with the aspirations of democracy. It is probable that, even with the removal of all artificial barriers to free movement, common labor would still remain, as its present name implies, the most common and the least paid. But such great discrepancies as the world has hitherto accepted as a matter of course are not inevitable. They bring grave social dangers in the intensification of class prejudice and class struggles. They bring a false attitude in the rest of the community towards all manual labor—an unworthy contempt for indispensable work. An elevation of this group to a plane of higher pay and better social regard would indeed mean that other groups would be relatively worse off—they would no longer secure the fruits of hard labor on cheap terms; but it would mean a better distribution of happiness."[3]

Professor Smart writes that "the lowest level of labor is not that at which the laborer dies for want of necessaries, but that at which his labor becomes inefficient and unprofitable; where the laborer is cut off by the employer as 'not worth his meat.' Or if we put it in terms of the laborer, we must look on the laborer as he is—a machine brought to great perfection, not of strength, indeed, but of delicacy and complexity, in the making of which much capital has been sunk and risked. The question is not between starving and not starving the laborer, but between letting a fine machine go to rust and keeping it in first-rate working order."[4]

Yes, and since man is something more than a fine machine, since he is an intellectual and moral being, he has other requirements which must be satisfied in order that he may lead a full human life. In addition, then, to the primary necessities of existence he may claim (1) reasonable leisure and recreation, (2) access to the means of culture, (3) the means of satisfying the desires of his nature from the ethical and religious standpoint, (4) the possibility of marrying and bringing up a family.

An objection to the doctrine of the living wage has been raised by Mr. Wicksteed. He does not deny that a man and his family are entitled to the means of subsistence, but he rejects the theory that this should necessarily come in the form of wages. He maintains that a man's wage, under a system of open competition, is

[3] "Principles of Economics," F. W. Taussig, Vol. II., page 139.
[4] "Distribution of Income," William Smart, page 201.

what he is worth to his employer—the marginal value of his labor. "Hence," he continues, "if we say that any kind of service is over or underpaid in the open market, we must be speaking in accordance with some ideal conception; for instance, the idea of what is due to a man, as such, rather than what he commands in virtue of the significance to others of what he can do."[5]

One may perhaps start with accepting this statement and claiming for a man a living wage not so much as a *measure* of his work, but as a *return* for the work which is his sole means of support.

But, on the other hand, fictitious values of labor may be created in various ways. There is not really fair bargaining in the open competition of the market, since although labor may be as necessary to capital in the long run as capital is to labor, yet the laborer cannot afford to wait, and is therefore obliged to sell his labor at a disadvantage.

Again, custom and convention have much to do with the fixing of wages, and any change in public opinion of the question of fair profits and fair wages would affect the "marginal value of a man's labor."

In olden times in England a fair wage was looked on as every man's right, and Professor Ashley tells us that usual wages were probably reasonable wages up to at least the middle of the fifteenth century.[6]

Since a man has a natural right to marry, the living wage should be a family living wage when there is a family to support. This was admitted by Adam Smith, though not, it seems, on ethical grounds. "A man must always live by his work," he writes, "and his wages must at least be sufficient to maintain him. They must even upon most occasions be somewhat more; otherwise it would be impossible to bring up a family, and the race of such workmen could not last beyond the first generation."[7]

Here it must at once be admitted there is a certain danger. However much one may be persuaded that the family is the unit of society and that the man, as the head of the family, has the duty of supporting it, one must not lose sight of the fact that the wife and children have their individual rights apart from the man, and that their claim to subsistence does not rest solely on his power and will to work. If he fails in his duty, society may inflict punishment on him, but will assuredly supply his neglect.

Again, it is beginning to be recognized more and more that woman's work in a home is of great social value and is therefore

---

5 "The Common Sense of Political Economy," P. H. Wicksteed, page 339.
6 "Economic History," W. T. Ashley, Part II., page 335.
7 "Wealth of Nations" (1776), Vol. I., page 83.

entitled to a wage. Must this necessarily come through her husband's trade? Should it not rather be a charge on society as a whole? If so, this would point in the direction of adequate and continuous State endowment of motherhood and would simplify the question of the living wage by taking from it the element of variability according to the number of a man's family.

But putting aside this question of a State wage for mothers, there is still the necessity of a living family wage. It is suggested by some that this should be a fixed wage for a normal family—by which is meant an average-sized family. This would probably have the effect of limiting the birth-rate to this level, and the average would constantly decline. Another suggestion is that the wage should vary with the size of the family to be supported. Against this it is urged that it is entirely impracticable and that no one would employ a workman who had a large family.

Now, it is a fact that in many cases employers prefer married men to single men, and the reason alleged is that married men are more stable and dependable and less likely to throw up a situation. An employer who holds this view would be willing to pay higher wages to a married man. The same argument would hold good in preferring a man with a large family to a man with a small one.

Again, although in the case of a man with a large family his wage would reach a high level during a certain period, it would decline when the children became self-supporting. And also it should be remembered that there exist at present arbitrary standards of wages according to age and sex, but it has not yet been found that either sex or any particular age has been ousted from the labor market on this ground. And since arbitrary standards have been fixed by means of Trades Unions according to age, there is no inherent impossibility in the supposition that, with good organization and the backing of public opinion, similar results might be attained in the case of an increasing family. The principle of variation of income according to the size of the family has already been recognized by the abatement of income tax increasing with the number of children.

The payment of an average family wage to all workers, irrespective of whether they have a family or not, or of the size of their family, if they have one, can hardly be claimed as a matter of justice. For the claim to a family wage rests on the duty of supporting a family, and if a man has not exercised the right of parenthood, he cannot claim the means to enable him to carry out obligations which he has not incurred.

There are certain objections which have been raised, not so much to the principle of the living wage as to its practicability.

The first objection commonly made is that the payment of a living wage would entail a raising of prices, and that, therefore, only a nominal and not a real advantage would be secured. This argument is not altogether valid, for the class of consumers is larger than the class of wage-earners, and therefore the rise in prices being distributed over the whole community, the workers would get some advantage from their advance in wages, though not all the advantage which the nominal wage would seem to indicate. In some cases also wages are so small in relation to the price of the articles produced that a considerable rise would have very little effect on price. In so far as the objection is valid, it goes to prove that a real rise in wages can only be attained by altering the distribution of wealth. As long as enormous wealth is concentrated in the hands of a few, it is impossible that the mass of the people should be in other than extreme poverty.

Another objection which is often raised against the fixing of a living wage is that it would mean throwing out of work many elderly or inefficient workers who were not considered worth this wage. Professor Smart notes the fact that "employers compelled to pay the minimum rate are compelled to get their money's worth out of the workers, and so skilled men are superannuated at forty-five, till workingmen dye their hair and reject the friendly spectacles lest their age should betray itself."[8]

To this it may be replied that the tendency of the increased wage would be such as to render the workers more efficient, as they would be secured adequate food and clothing, improved housing conditions and so on. But some would no doubt be thrown out of work. On the other hand, some whose wages had been subsidized by the rates or by private charity would become independent. The net result, therefore, would be a better classification of labor according to efficiency—an altogether desirable result from the standpoint of the problem of poverty.

The last objection to be considered is that industries would not be able to bear the cost of the increased wage.

It is no doubt true that many individual employers would be unable to continue their business in spite of the fact that increased wages would have a return in more efficient work. The results of increased efficiency would not be immediately apparent and the small employer could not afford to wait. It must be expected that in any scheme of social reform, any readjustment of our industrial organization, there must be present suffering inflicted on individuals. Progress demands sacrifice.

It is not, however, true to say that the industries themselves would

[8] "The Distribution of Income," William Smart, page 70.

not be able to bear the cost of a living wage if only reasonable and fair profits were made. Or, if it were ever true, it would show that the industry was a parasitic industry, thriving at the expense of human life. The argument that industries will not be able to bear the cost of improved conditions has been brought forward time and again, and as often disproved when the reform has been effected by legislation. As far as one can yet ascertain, the result of the working of the Trade Boards Act, which secures a minimum, though not necessarily a *living* wage, in certain trades, it does not seem to have a tendency to ruin home industry and drive trade into the hands of foreign competitors. And one may hope that at some future time the latter danger may be altogether obviated by an international agreement on the subject of a living wage.

The question of the *amount* of the living wage need not be considered. It will differ in the town and in the country; it will vary according to the reasonable standard of life of the worker.

It is sufficient to urge the *principle* of the living wage on the ground that a man has a fundamental right to live a full human life and that normally he can only secure that right by means of work and wages. It is this which is the pressing root-question of the hour—not mental deficiency. The security of a living wage for every worker will be a more potent and widespread factor in checking immorality; the improved conditions which it will be the means of providing will prove of greater eugenic value than the segregation of those feeble-minded persons who, in the words of the Royal Commission, are "capable of earning their living under favorable circumstances."

To secure this living wage must ultimately be the work of legislation, but before legislation is had there must be right public opinion, and this can only be obtained if there are brought to bear on economic questions those ethical principles which are so deeply rooted in our nature.

E. C. Fortey.

Leicester, England.

LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE

Ad Archiepiscopos et Episcopos Americae Latinae de Misera Indorum Conditione Sublevanda.

PIUS PP. X.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem:

LACRIMABILI statu Indorum ex inferiori America vehementer commotus, decessor Noster illustris, Benedictus XIV. gravissime eorum causam egit, ut nostis, in Litteris *Immensa Pastorum,* die XXII mensis Decembris anno MDCCXLI datis; et quia, quae ille deploravit scribendo, ea fere sunt etiam Nobis multis locis deploranda, idcirco ad earum Litterarum memoriam sollicite Nos animos vestros revocamus. Ibi enim cum alia, tum haec conqueritur Benedictus, etsi diu multumque Apostolica Sedes relevandae horum afflictae fortunae studuisset, esse tamen etiamtum "homines orthodoxae Fidei cultores, qui veluti caritatis in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum diffusae sensuum penitus obliti, miseros Indos non solum Fidei luce carentes, verum etiam sacro regenerationis lavacro ablutos, aut in servitutem redigere, aut veluti mancipia aliis vendere aut eos bonis privare, eaque inhumanitate cum iisdem agere praesumant, ut ab amplectenda Christi fide potissimum avertantur, et ad odio habendam maximopere obfirmentur." Harum quidem indignitatum ea quae est pessima, id est servitus proprii nominis, paullatim postea, Dei miserentis munere, de medio pulsa est: ad eamque in Brasilia aliisque regionibus publice abolendam multum contulit materna Ecclesiae instantia apud egregios viros qui eas Respublicas gubernabant. Ac libenter fatemur, nisi multa et magna rerum et locorum impedimenta obstitissent, eorum consilia longe meliores exitus habitura fuisse. Tametsi igitur pro Indis aliquid est actum, tamen multo plus est quod superest. Equidem cum scelera et maleficia reputamus, quae in eos adhuc admitti solent, sane horremus animo summaque calamitosi generis miseratione afficimur. Nam quid tam crudele tamque barbarum, quam levissimas saepe ob causas nec raro ex mera libidine saeviendi, aut flagris homines laminisque ardentibus caedere; aut repentina oppressos vi, ad centenos, ad millenos, una occidione perimere; aut pagos vicosque vastare ad internecionem indigenarum: quorum quidem nonnullas tribus accepimus his paucis annis prope esse deletas? Ad animos adeo efferandos plurimum sane valet cupiditas lucri; sed non paullum quoque valet caeli natura regionumque situs. Etenim, cum subiecta ea loca sint austro aestuoso, qui, languore quodam venis immisso, nervos virtutis tamquam elidit; cumque a consuetudine religionis,

a vigilantia Reipublicae, ab ipsa propemodum civili consortione procul absint, facile fit, ut si qui non perditis moribus illuc advenerint, brevi tamen depravari incipiant, ac deinceps, effractis officii iurisque repagulis, ad omnes immanitates vitiorum delabantur. Nec vero ab istis sexus aestatisve imbecillitati parcitur; quin imo pudet referre eorum in conquirendis mercandisque feminis et pueris flagitia atque facinora, quibus postrema ethnicae turpitudinis exempla vinci verissime dixeris. Nos equidem aliquandiu, cum de his rebus rumores afferrentur, dubitavimus tantae atrocitati factorum adiungere fidem: adeo incredibilia videbantur. Sed postquam a locupletissimis testibus, hoc est, a plerisque vestrum, Venerabiles Fratres, a Delegatis Sedis Apostolicae, a missionalibus aliisque viris fide prorsus dignis certiores facti sumus, iam non licet Nobis hic de rerum veritate ullum habere dubium. Iam dudum igitur in ea cogitatione defixi, ut, quantum est in Nobis, nitamur tantis mederi malis, prece humili ac supplici petimus a Deo, velit benignus opportunam aliquam demonstrare Nobis viam medendi. Ipse autem qui Conditor Redemptorque amantissimus est omnium hominum, cum mentem Nobis iniecerit elaborandi pro salute Indorum, tum certo dabit quae proposito conducant. Interim vero illud Nos valde consolatur, quod qui istas Respublicas gerunt, omni ope student insignem hanc ignominiam et maculam a suis Civitatibus depellere: de quo quidem studio laudare eos et probare haud satis possumus. Quamquam in iis regionibus ut sunt procul ab imperii sedibus remotae ac plerumque inviae, haec, plena humanitatis, conata civilium potestatum, sive ob calliditatem maleficorum qui tempori confinia transeunt, sive ob inertiam atque perfidiam administrorum, saepe parum proficiunt, non raro etiam in irritum cadunt. Quod si ad Reipublicae operam opera Ecclesiae accesserit, tum demun qui optantur fructus, multo exsistent uberiores. Itaque vos ante alios appellamus, Venerabiles Fratres, ut peculiares quasdam curas cogitationesque conferatis in hanc causam, quae vestro dignissima est pastorali officio et munere. Ac cetera permittentes sollicitudini industriaeque vestrae, hoc primum omnium vos impense hortamur, ut quaecumque in vestris dioecesibus instituta sunt Indorum bono, ea perstudiose promoveatis, itemque curetis instituenda quae ad eamdem rem utilia fore videantur. Deinde admonebitis populos vestros diligenter de proprio ipsorum sanctissimo officio adiuvandi sacras expeditiones ad Indigenas, qui Americanum istud solum primi incoluerint. Sciant igitur duplici praesertim ratione se huic rei debere prodesse: collatione stipis et suffragio precum; idque ut faciant non solum Religionem a se, sed Patriam ipsam postulare. Vos autem, ubicumque datur opera conformandis rite moribus, id est, in Seminariis, in ephebeis, in domibus puellaribus maximeque

in sacris aedibus efficite, ne unquam commendatio praedicatioque cesset caritatis christianae, quae omnes homines, sine ullo nationis aut coloris discrimine, germanorum fratrum loco habet; quaeque non tam verbis, quam rebus factisque probanda est. Pariter nulla praetermitti debet, quae offeratur, occasio demonstrandi quantum nomini christiano dedecus aspergant hae rerum indignitates, quas hic denunciamus. Ad Nos quod attinet, bonam habentes non sine causa spem de asensu et favore potestatum publicarum, eam praecipue suscepimus curam, ut, in ista tanta latitudine regionum, apostolicae actionis amplificemus campum, aliis disponendis missionalium stationibus, in quibus Indi perfugium et praesidium salutis inveniant. Ecclesia enim catholica numquam sterilis fuit hominum apostolicorum, qui, urgente Jesu Christi caritate, prompti paratique essent vel vitam ipsam pro fratribus ponere. Hodieque, cum tam multi a Fide vel abhorrent, vel deficiunt, ardor tamen disseminandi apud barbaros Evangelii non modo non inter viros utriusque Cleri sacrasque virgines remittitur, sed crescit etiam lateque diffunditur, virtute nimirum Spiritus Sancti, qui Ecclesiae, sponsae suae, pro temporibus subvenit. Quare his praesidiis quae, divino beneficio, Nobis praesto sunt, oportere putamus eo copiosius uti ad Indos e Satanae hominumque perversorum servitute liberandos, quo maior eos necessitas premit. Ceterum, cum istam terrarum partem praecones Evangelii suo non solum sudore, sed ipso nonnumquam cruore imbuerint, futurum confidimus, ut ex tantis laboribus aliquando christianae humanitatis laeta messis efflorescat in optimos fructus. Iam, ut ad ea, quae vos vel vestra sponte vel hortatu Nostro acturi estis in utilitatem Indorum, quanta maxima potest, efficacitatis accessio ex apostolica Nostra auctoritate fiat, Nos, memorati Decessoris exemplo immanis criminis damnamus declaramusque reos, quicumque, ut idem ait, "praedictos Indos in servitutem redigere, vendere, emere, commutare vel donare, ab uxoribus et filiis separare, rebus et bonis suis spoliare, ad alia loca deducere et transmittere, aut quoquo modo libertate privare, in servitude retinere; nec non praedicta agentibus consilium, auxilium, favorem et operam quocumque praetextu et quaesito colore praestare, aut id licitum praedicare seu docere, atque alias quomodolibet praemissis cooperari audeant seu praesumant." Itaque potestatem absolvendi ab his criminibus paenitentes in foro sacramentali Ordinariis locorum reservatam volumus.

Haec Nobis, cum paternae voluntati Nostrae obsequentibus, tum etiam vestigia persequentibus complurium e Decessoribus Nostris, in quibus commenorandus quoque est nominatim Leo XIII. fel. rec., visum est ad vos, Venerabiles Fratres, Indorum causa, scribere. Vestrum autem erit contendere pro viribus, ut votis Nostris cumulate

satisfiat. Fauturi certe hac in re vobis sunt, qui Respublicas istas administrant; non deerunt sane, operam studiumque navando, qui de Clero sunt, in primisque addicti sacris missionibus; denique aderunt sine dubio omnes boni, ac sive opibus, qui possunt, sive aliis caritatis officiis causam iuvabunt, in qua rationes simul versantur Religionis et humanae dignitatis. Quod vero caput est, aderit Dei omnipotentis gratia; cuius Nos auspicem itemque benevolentiae Nostrae testem, vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, gregibusque vestris apostolicam benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die VII mensis Iunii MCMXII., Pontificatus Nostri anno nono.

PIUS PP. X.

ENCYCLICAL OF HIS HOLINESS PIUS X.,

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE,

ON THE CONDITION OF THE INDIANS,

To the Archbishops and Bishops of Latin America.

PIUS X. POPE.

Venerable Brothers, Health and the Apostolic Benediction:

DEEPLY moved by the pitiful state of the Indians of South America, our illustrious predecessor, Benedict XIV., earnestly pleaded for them, as you know, in his letter *Immensa Pastorum*, dated December 22, 1741; and as we have to deplore almost the very things which he deplored when he wrote, therefore do we hasten to remind you of that letter of his. Therein indeed does Benedict complain, amongst other things, that although the Holy See had long done a great deal to alleviate their sad lot, nevertheless there were even then "men who as it were wholly unmindful of the feelings of charity infused into our hearts by the Holy Ghost, presume not only in the case of the Indians who are deprived of the light of faith, but even of those who have been bathed in the sacred laver of regeneration, either to make them slaves, or to sell them as slaves to others, or to plunder them of their possessions, or to act towards them with such inhumanity as to hinder them utterly from embracing the faith of Christ, or confirm them the more in their hatred toward it."

The worst of these indignities, namely, slavery properly so called, was, by the favor of the merciful God, soon afterwards abolished; and towards its public abolition in Brazil and in other regions the maternal entreaties of the Church made to the distinguished men who governed those States contributed much. Gratefully do we acknowledge that their designs would have led to much better results had not difficulties many and great, both of locality and circumstance, confronted them. Although something then has been done for the Indians, yet what still remains to be done is much greater. Indeed, when we consider the crimes and misdeeds which still are commonly done against them, our mind is stricken with horror and we feel the deepest pity for that unhappy race. What, indeed, is so cruel and so barbarous as, for reasons often trivial and not rarely for the mere pleasure of inflicting torture, to put men to death by scourging or with red-hot irons; or, suddenly attacking them, to massacre them, killing hundreds and thousands of them together; or to sack towns and villages, slaughtering the

natives, of whom within these past few years some tribes have, we learn, been almost exterminated? To render minds thus savage, the greed of gain certainly contributes in large measure, but the very nature of the climate and the situation of those regions also contribute not a little thereto. For those regions possess a torrid climate, which infects the blood with a certain languor and enfeebles strength of character; and it easily happens that if some persons who are not of depraved morals betake themselves thither, finding themselves strangers to every religious practice, far from the vigilance of the State and almost deprived of civil society, they begin in a short time to grow depraved, and, little by little, all restraints of duty and of law being removed, they plunge into all the excesses of vice. Nor do they spare the weakness of sex or age; indeed one is ashamed to record the crimes and misdeeds which they perpetrate, acquiring women and children and trafficking in them, so that they may be said with truth to have surpassed the worst examples of pagan depravity.

In truth, when rumors of this kind reached us, we hesitated for some time to give credit to such atrocities, so incredible did they appear to us. But having been fully informed by many witnesses, to wit, by the greater number of you, venerable brothers, by the Delegates of the Apostolic See, by the missionaries and by other persons wholly trustworthy, we can no longer lawfully doubt that these things are true.

Resolved, therefore, for a long time past to strive, as far as in us lies, to repair evils so great, we beg of God, with humble and suppliant entreaties, that He may benignantly indicate to us some suitable means of remedying them. He, who is the most loving Creator and Redeemer of all men, as He has inspired us to labor for the salvation of the Indians, will certainly supply us with the means of effecting our purpose. Meanwhile, however, it affords us the greatest consolation to know that the rulers of those republics are endeavoring by every means to rid their States of this stain and of this disgrace; which endeavor of theirs we cannot too highly approve and praise. Yet in those regions, distant as they are from the seats of government, remote and for the most part inaccessible, either through the craft of evildoers who opportunely cross the frontier, or through the apathy and perfidy of the officials, these efforts of the civil authorities oftentimes avail little, and not unfrequently fail altogether. But if to the efforts of the State were united those of the Church, the desired results world be more abundant.

To you, therefore, venerable brothers, before all others we appeal to devote special thought and care to this cause, which is eminently

worthy of your pastoral office and ministry. And leaving other things to your solicitude and zeal, before all else we earnestly exhort you to foster diligently all those institutions in your dioceses which are intended for the well-being of the Indians and to take steps to establish such others as may appear useful for the same purpose. You will also employ all diligence in impressing upon the faithful their sacred duty of assisting the missions to the natives, who were the first to inhabit American territory. Make known to them that in two ways they ought to aid this enterprise, to wit, by collecting offerings and by the assistance of their prayers; and that not only religion, but also the fatherland itself demands this at their hands. And you, wherever proper moral education is carried on, that is to say, in the seminaries, in institutions for the young, in schools for girls, and above all in the churches, take care that there be no flagging in the inculcation and preaching of Christian charity, which regards all men as brethren, without distinction of nation or color, and which is to be shown not only by words, but by deeds. In like manner, no opportunity which presents itself of showing what dishonor is brought upon the Christian name by the reprehensible deeds which we have here denounced, should be allowed to pass.

As regards ourselves, as we reasonably cherish good hopes of the consent and favor of the public authorities, it shall be our principal care to extend, in these regions so vast, the field of apostolic enterprise, by instituting further missionary stations in which the Indians will find a refuge and a place of safety. Indeed, the Catholic Church has never lacked apostolic men who, urged by the charity of Jesus Christ, were not ready and willing to give even life itself for their brethren. And even to-day, when so many are averse to the faith, or renounce it, zeal for spreading the Gospel amongst the barbarians has not only not grown faint amongst persons of either grade of the clergy and amongst holy nuns, but is still increasing and diffuses itself more widely through the power of the Holy Spirit, Who, according to the necessities of the times, comes to the assistance of His Spouse. Wherefore we believe it to be our duty to avail ourselves the more abundantly of those means which are at our disposal for freeing the Indians from the slavery of Satan and from that of wicked men, inasmuch as the need which afflicts them is the greater. On the other hand, as those lands were by the preachers of the Gospel bedewed not only with their sweat, but also with their blood, we feel confident that from so many labors a gladsome harvest of Christian civilization will at length spring up and bear good fruit.

Meanwhile, in order that, through our apostolic authority, the

greatest possible efficacy may attend what you on your own initiative, or through our exhortation, are about to do for the welfare of the Indians, we, following the example of our predecessor already mentioned, condemn and declare guilty of a heinous crime all those, as he says, who "dare or presume to reduce the aforesaid Indians to slavery, to sell them, to buy them, to exchange them or donate them, to separate them from their wives and children, to despoil them of their effects or possessions, to carry or transport them elsewhere, or in any wise to deprive them of their liberty or to hold them as slaves, as well as to give counsel, aid or support under any pretext or plea whatsoever to those who do these things, or to teach and proclaim that all this is lawful, or in any other way to lend their coöperation to what has been stated above." We wish therefore to reserve to the local Ordinaries the power of absolving penitents from such crimes in the sacred tribunal of penance.

These things, venerable brothers, it has seemed good to us to write to you, in the interest of the Indians, both to obey the paternal promptings of our heart and to follow in the wake of so many of our predecessors, amongst whom is to be particularly mentioned Leo XIII. of happy memory. It will be for you to strive with all your might that our wishes may be fully realized. You will certainly have as supporters in this work the rulers of those republics. Surely the priests, and in the first instance those attached to the missions, will not fail to assist you by work and advice. In fine, all good people will doubtless assist you; and whether with money, those who can, or by other efforts of charity, they will favor an enterprise in which are at the same time involved considerations of religion and of human dignity. But what is of chief importance, Almighty God will assist you with His grace, as a token of which, and also as a proof of our paternal benevolence, we impart with all our heart to you, venerable brothers, and to your flocks the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the 7th of June, 1912, in the ninth year of our pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline and History of the Catholic Church. In fifteen volumes. Vol. XIV.: Simony—Toour. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

That each succeeding volume of the Catholic Encyclopedia is up to the standard of the preceding volumes has become a trite saying. We have become so accustomed to it that we take it for granted. No one is surprised that it is so, but one should be very much surprised were it not so. The calculations of the editors as to the amount of space required for the whole work must have been very accurately made, for it is clear now that the book will be completed with the next volume and perfected in the supplemental volume, which will contain corrections, additions, indexes, biographies, etc., which belong naturally to a supplement.

Volume XIV. opens with a subject which occupies an important place in history, and which has been the cause of much misunderstanding, many calumnies and a great deal of controversy. "Simony" is here treated with that clearness, conciseness and completeness which is characteristic of the Encyclopedian and is gratifying to the reader.

"Socialism" is another subject of unusual interest at the present time, and the student will welcome this opportunity to get a correct understanding of this much-mooted question. The article on the "Jesuits," or rather the series of articles, is very complete, and welcome, because there is probably no subject which is more abused and about which men differ so much. Here is the truth stranger than fiction. "Spain" looms up big, occupying thirty-five pages. One of the most interesting and literary articles of moderate size is on "Stained Glass," by Caryl Coleman. It is a pity it is not illustrated.

"Syllabus" is important, because so often misunderstood, and because sources of information are few.

"Suicide" is timely, because self-destruction is becoming commoner every day, and the scandal of it is working havoc among persons of every age and all stations. A true knowledge of the gravity of it and its terrible consequences ought to be sufficient to restrain persons of faith who have not hitherto been courageous enough to resist the tendency.

"Theology" and "St. Thomas of Aquin" are treated in an ex-

haustive manner and are among the most important topics of the book.

Attention has been called to only a few of the more striking headings, but the volume as a whole furnishes information on a variety of subjects which cannot be readily gotten elsewhere and forms an important part of the whole work, whose value is beyond price.

THE LIFE OF JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN. Based on His Private Journals and Correspondence. By *Wilfrid Ward*. With fifteen portraits and other illustrations. In two volumes, 8vo. Vol. I., 666 pages; Vol. II., 636 pages. $9.00, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Cardinal Newman died in 1890; Mr. Ward's life of him was published in 1912. It is generally agreed that it is undoubtedly the most important book of the year, and that no biography in the English language has ever attracted more widespread attention or excited greater interest not limited to any country nor to any special class of persons, but extending to all thoughtful and studious men, irrespective of creed or nationality.

Mr. Ward could hardly expect a higher compliment for his work or greater commendation than this widespread interest, and the approval that has accompanied it. The universal attention which the life of Cardinal Newman attracts twenty-two years after his death witnesses the greatness of the subject; but the no less universal approval and unstinted praise which the work has won in so short a time speaks eloquently of the ability, the judgment, the zeal, the faithfulness and the fearlessness of the author.

The first impulse of a reviewer of this book is to summarize it. But that is very difficult. Cardinal Newman's life was so full that even Mr. Ward's biography, filling two large volumes, seems only a summary. Again, the reviewer is tempted to question the wisdom of revealing the inner thoughts of the subject or publishing his opinions of men and things which have been expressed in private letters or diaries not intended for the public gaze and set down in moments of disappointment or chagrin. But Mr. Ward's explanation of his reasons for following this course are convincing and carry the question away from the field of discussion. The other temptation, to dwell upon any particular epoch or incident of the Cardinal's life with special emphasis, is also to be rejected, because the conclusion to which one is led who gives any attention to the book at all is that it must be read from beginning to end by all who wish to know Cardinal Newman. Indeed, Mr. Ward himself gives us this warning. The Cardinal was always a big man, he could not

take any part in small things and could not take a small part in larger things. Whenever he appeared he was big and interesting, and everything that he touched became important. He was so much a part of the great events of the time in which he lived, and so important a part, that he must be understood in order to understand them. In a word, whoever would know the England of Cardinal Newman's time, must know the Cardinal, and whoever would know him, must know Mr. Ward's biography.

LIVES OF THE FRIAR SAINTS. Editors for the Franciscan Lives: *Very Rev. Father Osmund, O. F. M.*, Provincial, and *C. M. Antony.* Editors for the Dominican Lives: *Rev. Father Bede Jarrett, O. P.*, and *C. M. Antony.* Fcp., 8vo. Each volume, illustrated, $0.50, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

ST. PIUS V., Pope of the Holy Rosary. By *C. M. Antony.* With a Preface by Very Rev. Monsignor R. H. Benson.

ST. VINCENT FERRER, O. P. By *Father Stanislaus M. Hogan, O. P., S. T. L.*

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS, of the Order of Preachers (1225-1274). A Biographical Study of the Angelic Doctor. By *Father Placid Conway,* O. P.

ST. BONAVENTURE, the Seraphic Doctor, Minister General of the Franciscan Order, Cardinal Bishop of Albano. By *Father Laurence Costelloe,* O. *F. M.*

ST. JOHN CAPISTRAN. By *Father Vincent FitzGerald,* O. *F. M.*

ST. ANTONY OF PADUA, the Miracle Worker (1195-1231). By *C. M. Antony.*

The lives of the saints should be widely read by all persons of a reading age, irrespective of nationality or creed, because they point the way to heaven in a practical way. The Church teaches her children constantly what they must do to be saved—what they must believe, what they must practice, what means they must use in order to make their faith live and bear fruit. Then she supplements her teaching by holding up before them the examples of the saints—men and women like themselves, who by believing and accomplishing have earned heaven. All who desire salvation should study the lives of these guides, which like luminous torches blazon the way heavenward.

It is to be feared that many persons do not make use of this effective means of drawing nearer to God. Various reasons may be given for this failure. Not all the saints are equally interesting; biographers sometimes fail to produce the natural man at all, because they give too much attention to the supernatural; the biographies are often unnecessarily long and tiresome, going into infinite detail, which interests only highly spiritual readers or special students. Brief, bright, interesting sketches of saints who led active lives such as men lead now and dealt with problems such as confront us at the present time ought to appeal to a very large class of readers.

Such a series we find in the "Lives of the Friar Saints." They are attractive and irresistible.

PSYCHOTHERAPY. Including the History of the Use of Mental Influence, Directly and Indirectly, in Healing and the Principles for the Application of Energies Derived From the Mind to the Treatment of Disease. By *James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D.*, Dean and Professor of Functional Nervous Diseases and of the History of Medicine at Fordham University. 8vo., pp. 800. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

This book consists of material gathered from a course of lectures given by the author at Fordham University during the last five years. Addressed to medical students and not specialists, the language employed is as mechanical as possible, and was intended to be such as young physicians might use to their patients for suggestion purposes. The historical part is unusually full, because the place of Psychotherapy in the past is very important, and because Psychotherapeutics has appeared under so many forms that a historical résumé of its many phases seemed the best kind of an introduction to a book which pleads for more extensive and more deliberate use of Psychotherapy in our time.

This is probably the first time in the history of medicine that a text-book of the whole subject has been written. There have been applications of psychotherapeutics to functional and other special forms of disease, but not specifically to all the organic diseases.

The author modestly disclaims all hope to make a perfectly satisfactory text-book on such a subject at the first attempt. We feel sure that Dr. Walsh has succeeded in his work far beyond his expectations. His general education, his philosophical training, his full experience and his rare intellectual power fit him especially for a work of this kind, where such ability and such equipment are vitally important.

It is a subject which has attracted a great deal of attention lately, and one which is liable to much misunderstanding and abuse. It is particularly dangerous for the ignorant and unscrupulous, and Dr. Walsh's work should prove a protection against both classes, almost equally dangerous. One of the most interesting chapters in the book is the last, which treats of Religion and Psychotherapy, for it is here that men are most apt to go astray.

MIRIAM LUCAS. By *Canon P. A. Sheehan, D. D.* Crown 8vo., $1.35, net; by mail, $1.50. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The story of an Irish girl who starts out in life handicapped by some mystery connected with her birth and parentage and by a curse which hangs over her old home. Ostracized by "society," she

turns to the poor people for sympathy and affection and becomes an ardent upholder of their rights in spite of the cruel opposition of her guardian. From Ireland the scene is transferred to New York, where, after many adventures, Miriam finds her long-lost mother, and also her husband in the man who, with her, is destined to lift the curse from her home at Glendarragh.

Like all Canon Sheehan's stories, this one is very interesting. The language, the scenes, the characters, the incidents, all show the hand of the master and hold the reader to the end. The writer is at his best in Ireland. Those who admire him most do not like to see him leave it. He can take his readers to his native land and make them live there, breathing its air, admiring its scenery, learning its customs and making the acquaintance of its people. We are tempted to wish sometimes that he would show us more of the bright side. There is a little too much of the brown and gray, and these quickly merge into black when the shadows fall. If Canon Sheehan could see the Irish people with the kindly eyes of the late Henry Harlan, how his books would sparkle! Of course, we must make due allowance for the difference between Italian and Irish temperament and atmosphere.

When the author leaves Ireland and the Irish people he loses much by contrast. His picture of New York, where the heroine of the present story lives for a short time, would do for any large modern city, and the portrait of the street gamin whom she befriends is English and not American.

These remarks are not made in a fault-finding spirit or a disparaging way, but rather for the purpose of helping to make that which is very good even better.

THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC. An Inquiry Into the Principles of Accurate Thought and Scientific Method. By *P. Coffey, Ph. D.* Two volumes, pp. 465 and 366. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

An original work on logic is not possible in the strict sense, but a new book strictly up-to-date, because it shows that there is no contradiction between scholasticism and true modern mental science, and because the author is in touch with recent logicians and uses all modern means and methods, without, however, departing from the canons of traditional logic, is certainly worthy of serious consideration and a warm welcome. If further justification were required, it could be found in the equipment of the reverend author, who won his degree at Louvain, who is professor of logic and metaphysics at Maynooth, and who is the author of the "History of Mediæval Philosophy" and the translator of Professor de Wulf's "Introduction to Scholastic Philosophy."

Dr. Coffey very modestly says of his purpose in the present work: "The aim and scope of this treatise are more modest than perhaps its dimensions might suggest. It attempts, in the first place, to present in a simple way the Principles of the Traditional Logic of Aristotle and his scholastic interpreters; secondly, to show how the philosophical teachings of Aristotle and the Schoolmen contain the true basis for modern methods of scientific investigation, inductive no less than deductive; and finally, to extend rather than supplement the traditional body of logical doctrine by applying the latter to some logical problems raised in more recent times. But the treatment throughout is confined mainly to principles and is meant to be suggestive rather than exhaustive."

The book is a splendid contribution to philosophical literature and a most effective antidote for the false, defective and destructive systems of philosophy in all its branches that are being written and taught in many of the secular schools of the country and even in some of the highest and most pretentious.

CONCILIUM TRIDENTINUM. Diariorum, Actorum, Epistolarum, Tractatuum, Nova Collectio. Editit Societas Goerresiana. Tomus Secundus et Tomus Quintus. $20.00, net. Friburgi Brisgoviae: B. Herder.

This great historical work, begun about ten years ago under the auspices of the Goerres Society, which represents the best talent of United Catholic Germany, is carried forward with encouraging success by the appearance of these two volumes. There can be no question of the inestimable value of a full history of the Council of Trent. Its importance cannot be exaggerated from any point of view. Doctrine, discipline, ceremonial and morals in modern times are dated from it, because in it truth was confirmed, falsehood was denied, ceremonial and discipline were revived and corrected, calumny was refuted, and controversy ended. The history of previous councils may be read to a great extent in the Council of Trent, and if all those previous records were lost, the acts of the earlier councils would still be preserved in their repromulgation by the later council.

No one could estimate accurately the extent of this work who had not made an exhaustive study of it, or had not examined what has already been done by Dr. Merkle and Monsignor Ehses under the Goerres Society. The size of the volumes which have already appeared, the enormous amount of matter which they contain and the ground still to be covered is startling, and one can easily understand why a full history of the council did not appear sooner. To one who is at all familiar with the histories of Fra Paolo Sarpi

and of Cardinal Pallacino, this book will be acceptable at once as the arbiter between them from whom there is no appeal.

Four volumes have now appeared, and it is expected that the work will be completed in twelve volumes. As the edition is necessarily very limited, and in all probability it will never be reprinted, universities, seminaries, colleges and institutions of higher learning generally should secure copies at once.

THEODICY. Essays on Divine Providence. By *Antonio Rosmini Serbati.* Translated, with some omissions, from the Milan edition of 1845. Three volumes. Crown 8vo., pp. xxxiv.+1,006, $7.00, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Theodicy signifies "Justice of God," and it is used as the title of this work, because its purpose is to vindicate the Equity and Goodness of God in the distribution of good and evil in the world.

All three volumes treat of the same subject, but under different aspects. Although each book may stand by itself, and in a certain way may be said to exhaust its own special theme, nevertheless they are mutually related in such a way that one helps to complete the others. The connection of the three books is as follows: The first is *Logical.* It expounds and lays down the rules which the human mind must follow in it sjudgments regarding the dispositions of Divine Goodness, in order not to fall into error. It is intended to remove the first cause of errors which men commit in judging of the supreme dispositions according to which God permits evil, bestows good, and distributes both among His creatures. This cause is the want of logical cognitions. The second book is *Physical.* It is a continual meditation on the laws of nature on the essential limitations of created things, on the concatenation of causes. It combats another cause of errors respecting the dealings of Divine Providence, the want of physical cognitions.

The third book is *Hyperphysical,* and combats the third cause of errors common to censurers of Divine Providence, namely, the want of theological cognitions.

The importance of the work may be judged from this outline. It is not written for theologians, but for the people, and therefore the author has not adopted a rigorously scientific style. For the same reason also he has abstained from introducing certain more difficult speculations.

As no argument is used more frequently against the goodness and justice of God and even against His very existence than the co-existence of good and evil and their apparent uneven distribution, and as this argument is now being most extensively used by those who are preaching Socialism in the extreme and worse sense of

the word, the work takes on a special importance and greater value by reason of its timeliness. A summary of it in short, clear form for general distribution ought to do immense good.

LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. A New Life of St. Francis. By *Father Cuthbert, O. S. F. C.* With thirteen illustrations. 8vo. Price, $3.50, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

"It would, perhaps, be too hazardous to assert that Father Cuthbert has written the final biography of St. Francis of Assisi, but few will be found to deny that he has more nearly attained that goal than any of his predecessors. . . . It is not that we learn much which is definitely new about his life or character, but rather that his latest biographer diplays a deeper insight, a finer sympathy than any of those who have gone before him; and this is as we should expect it to be. Who better than a Fransiscan friar of "the poorest of all the orders" should understand *il poverel di Dio,* God's own mendicant? . . . We certainly shall not venture to join issue with Father Cuthbert on his own especial ground. Rather would we end as we have begun with the clear sound of praise, warmly commending to all lovers of St. Francis a work which thoroughly deserves a catholic welcome in the most literal sense of the word."

All reviewers can without hesitation subscribe to this declaration concerning this new life of St. Francis. Much has been written about him, some of it true and some fanciful. Probably no other Catholic saint has attracted so many biographers and so many readers outside of the Church. With many admirers he is a fad rather than a model. It is most important that the life of such a saint should be written by the sympathetic hand of a brother, a student and a scholar, lest truth should be lost in fancy and fact be confused with fiction. Father Cuthbert's "Life of St. Francis of Assisi" does this, and therefore it can be recommended to all serious-minded, devout persons who look upon the saints of God as His faithful servants, to be imitated and invoked, rather than as quaint figures to deck the walls of my lady's boudoir because of their girdled bodies, their sandled feet and their tonsured heads.

THE MASS. A Study of the Roman Liturgy. By *Rev. Adrian Fortescue, Ph. D., D. D.* Crown 8vo., $1.80, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

A new book on the Mass seems superfluous at first sight, and yet any one who takes up Dr. Fortescue's book will acknowledge that it isn't. The subject itself is inexhaustible, and when an author

so well equipped and with such authority as Dr. Fortescue treats it the result is sure to be a very valuable contribution to the literature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The author tells us that his book is intended to supply information about the history of the Roman liturgy and does not treat the dogmatic side of the Mass. As the Roman (or Gallican) rite is the only one in which the Eucharistic service can correctly be called the Mass, the book is limited to a study of the Roman liturgy principally. The chapter about other liturgies and frequent references to them is for the purpose of putting the Roman Mass in its proper perspective and for comparison.

The book begins with an account of the origin and development of the Mass in general and goes through the service as it stands now, adding notes to each prayer and ceremony.

Although the author acknowledges that the present time is hardly the most convenient for attempting a history of the Mass, because never before have there been so many and so various theories as to its origin, the development of the Canon, the Epiklesis and other questions, we are sure that all students will welcome the book as a most valuable contribution to the solution of these questions and to the final and complete history of the subject.

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES. By *Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C.*, author of "The Catholic School System in the United States." 12mo., cloth, net, $1.75. New York: Benziger Brothers.

It is the author's hope that the present volume, like the preceding one, may interest non-Catholic as well as Catholic students of education. His conviction, in undertaking and carrying on these studies, has been that so vast and important a thing as the Catholic parish school system, which has been built up at the cost of such heavy and continual sacrifice, which was begun in good faith at the time when denominational schools were the order of the day, and which long antedates the Federal and the State Constitutions, must command the respect if not the admiration of non-Catholics when they come to know it such as it is and such as it has been, and that it cannot fail to enlist the good will and sympathy of all those who can be brought to understand the real purpose for which it stands. It is only through a better mutual understanding in this way that Catholics and non-Catholics can ever arrive at a settlement of the "school question" that will be satisfactory to both.

The history of Catholic education in this country has been postponed too long, and we cannot be over-grateful to Dr. Burns for having taken up the work and for having carried it forward so

successfully. He was just the man for it. His educational studies and experience, his connection with Catholic educational work for many years, his active connection with the Catholic Educational Association as one of its founders and chief executive officers, all equip him in an exceptional manner for the task. The result is fully up to the expectation. This volume and its predecessor, "The Catholic School System of the United States," should make us proud of the work that has been done and strengthen and encourage us for greater efforts.

SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI. A Biography. By *Johannes Jörgensen*. Translated from the Danish with the author's sanction by T. O'Conor Sloane, Ph. D., LL. D. With five portraits and other illustrations. 8vo., pp. xvi.+428. $3.00, net; by mail, $3.16. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This is a translation from the Danish of a work which has already been rendered into both French and German, and which has received considerable commendation from the Continental critics.

The author, Johannes Jörgensen, a writer of reputation in various fields, while a comparatively recent convert to Catholicism, has devoted several years to visiting the localities associated with St. Francis; during his pilgrimages he received constant encouragement from prominent members of the order, as well as assistance in his studies in the wide field of Franciscan literature.

In addition to the narrative, the author gives an important appendix, "Authorities for the Life of St. Francis of Assisi." In this he deals with the writings of St. Francis, his biographers, the Franciscan legends, the histories of the order and some authorities outside of the order. A special index to the appendix, as well as an index to the general narrative, has been provided. The book is illustrated by three portraits of St. Francis and two other full-page reproductions, printed in double-tone on cameo plate paper.

The reception which the work has already received in the original Danish and in France and Germany, after its translation into the languages of those countries, places it beyond adverse criticism. The translation is unusually good, preserving the truth and unction of the original without sacrificing the demands of the best English.

EUCHARISTICA. Verse and Prose in Honor of the Hidden God. By *Rev. H. T. Henry, Litt. D.* 8vo., pp. 252. Price, $1.25, net. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press.

Dr. Henry has gathered together in this very attractive volume some original and translated Eucharistic verse with comment he has published in magazines at various times during the twenty

years just past, and has added some hitherto unpublished matter. He has also included a few renderings from Latin prose, such as the Prayers for the Blessing of Vestments and the "Prayer of St. Augustine."

As the author says: "If any apology were needed for such a volume as this, it could reasonably be based on the fact that our English devotional literature is not rich in Eucharistic treatments and that in respect of appropriate verse (whether original or translated) it is especially inadequate."

Those who are familiar with Dr. Henry's work could give another reason, and one that is alone sufficient, namely, the excellence of it. The beauty of thought, the elegant English, the correct metre, the accurate rhyming, all stamp the author as a scholar and claim for him a place in the literary world which is distinctly his own. This book is not only a literary gem, but it is also a strong aid to devotion.

HIS GREY EMINENCE: The True "Friar Joseph" of Bulwer Lytton's "Richelieu." A historical study of the Capuchin, Pere Joseph Francois le Clerc du Tremblay. 8vo., pp. 112. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press.

Those who have read Bulwer's "Richelieu," or who have seen it played, will remember the monk Joseph as the antithesis of the Cardinal, mean, servile, sycophantic, a clerical Uriah Heep. Perhaps they will be surprised to hear that he was nothing at all of the kind. That, on the contrary, he was a man of distinction in the social, political and ecclesiastical world of his time. As Richelieu was the power behind the throne, so Pere Joseph was the power behind Richelieu, whom he was instrumental in leading to the high and commanding position he occupied, and whom he would have succeeded as Prime Minister of France and as Cardinal if he had lived. This is not a romance, but it is history, and it is well worth reading. Mr. O'Connor does not draw a picture to take the place of Bulwer's bad portrait, but he brings forth a historic character with all his credentials.

Would that all who have been amused and deceived by the ghost of fiction might learn to know and admire the real man of fact. But this is too much to hope for. Catholics, at least, should seek the truth and learn it.

THE LITTLE CARDINAL. By *Olive Katharine Parr.* 12mo., cloth, $1.25. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"The Little Cardinal" is a most absorbing novel in which piety, pathos and humor are happily blended. The author, Olive Katharine Parr, is a very gifted and a graceful, charming writer. At an early

age she followed the example of her mother, beginning a long-continued work in the slums of London. In this new book she has drawn the characters from life; consequently the story possesses a realism and an interest not to be obtained by imaginary plots. Miss Parr's former literary achievements give us an assurance that any new work of hers will be found worth while. This book is no exception; on the contrary, it is the finest piece of work we have had from the pen of the author.

From the moment that Uriel, "The Little Cardinal," is introduced until we lay down the book at the end, our eyes dimmed with tears, the interest is unceasing. It is the story of a child, a little boy, that every one, young or old, who has a heart within him can read and sympathize with. There is no sickly sentimentalism about it; it is simply an unusually beautiful story, charmingly told.

THE FOOL OF GOD. A Historical Novel of the Pharaohs. By *Andrew Klarmann, A. M.*, author of "The Princess of Gan-sar," "Nizra," "Life in the Shadow of Death," etc. 8o., 533 pages, bound in artistically ornamented cloth cover, with gilt top, net, $1.50. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

"The Fool of God" is a chapter from the life-story of the Pharaohs of ancient Egypt, the shepherd-kings of Chanaan and the sheiks of Araby. It opens up a vista into the dim and silent past of four thousand years ago, and discloses a variety of scenes as much soliciting our sympathy as the scenes of human activity, affection and strife of to-day.

Four thousand years is a long time for people to have been silent. But just for this reason it is fascinating to make them reappear before us and let them tell their own tale of joy and sorrow.

In his descriptions the author has preserved, with admirable mastery, the quaint tinge of original, antique and volcanic humanity characteristic of the people who made history in those mystic days of old. He has reproduced the archaic types, prosperous cities and picturesque landscapes of Egypt, Araby and Chanaan, with a faithful and sympathetic pencil and has woven a story of love and struggle into his tale.

THE NEW PSALTER AND ITS USE. By *Rev. Edwin Burton, D. D.*, Vice President of St. Edmund's College, Ware, and *Rev. Edward Myers, M. A.*, Professor of Dogmatic Theology and Patrology at St. Edmund's College. Crown 8vo., $1.20, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This book is meant for the practical use of two distinct groups of readers: those who wish to form a clear idea of the connection between the new legislation and the old Rubrics and those who are beginning to say the Divine Office. Without explanation, the very

qualities which recommend the new Rubrics from a technical point of view may render the due appreciation of their contents somewhat difficult to those whose active duties render a careful study of their technicalities impossible.

We have first the Constitution, then a very complete history of the origin of the breviary and its reforms, proposed or accomplished, down to the present, and then a discussion of the characteristics of the new psalter. The book is closed with an unusually full and accurate index. The work is done so clearly and so interestingly that those who read the book must draw from it increased knowledge, devotion and faithfulness in the recitation of the Divine Office.

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM. Conforming strictly with the Decree "Divino Afflatu." Dimensions: Length, 5⅝ inches; width, 3¾ inches; thickness, ¾ inch; weight, per volume, 9½ ounces. Price list of bindings, net: Real black flexible morocco, round corners, gilt edges, $8.90; extra fine flexible rutland roan, round corners, marbled edges, $10.00; black extra fine genuine flexible Alaska seal, half leather lined, round corners, gilt edges, $10.50. Four volumes, 16mo. New York: Benziger Brothers.

As the Bull "Divino Afflatu" concerning the Breviary Reform goes into effect on January 1, 1913, all those who are bound to recite the Divine Office must get ready at once if they have not already done so. They can follow the new order in two ways—either by using the new Psalter in conjunction with the old Breviary or by getting a new Breviary which contains the new Psalter in place of the old one. Probably nearly every one has been following the former method in an experimental way during the present year, when the order was not of obligation; but when it must be followed daily, not many will be willing to keep two books at hand constantly and carry them about, when they can get one book that answers the purpose, that possesses all the good points of previous Breviaries, and that in some ways surpasses them. The new Breviary of Benziger Brothers answers this description. For completeness, practical arrangement and references it is unexcelled. Its special features are: Its remarkable size; fewer references than any other edition; its completeness, as it contains the newest offices in their proper places; its solid, flexible binding; its low price, and its large, legible type.

THE WAYS OF MENTAL PRAYER. By *Right Rev. Dom V. LeLodey.* Translated by a Monk of Mount Melleray, Ireland. 12mo., cloth, net, $1.75. New York: Benziger Brothers.

A valuable method for souls striving toward spiritual perfection. The able Cistercian monk who adapted the work for English-speak-

ing people must be congratulated on the success of his undertaking.

Father Poulain, S. J., author of the "Graces of Prayer" and an authority on the spiritual life, says to the author of this book:

"Your descriptions of divine grace are exact; it is easily perceived that not only you have consulted books, but that you have also come in contact with favored souls, which is an indispensable corrective of theoretical knowledge. Your ascetic counsels are very solid. Throughout your work there reigns a tone of piety which will elicit responsive echoes in every soul."

HOMILETIC AND CATECHETIC STUDIES. According to the Spirit of Holy Scripture and of the Ecclesiastical Year. By *A. Meyenberg*, Canon and Professor of Theology, Luzerne. Translated by the Very Rev. Ferdinand Brossart, V. G., Covington, Ky. Royal 8vo., pp. 845. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

Dr. Meyenberg is an experienced professor of many years' standing in colleges and seminaries and is also a preacher of well-known ability, so often called to the pulpit in various parts of Europe that he has become one of the foremost pulpit orators of the day. His knowledge as a teacher and his practice as a preacher led him to understand the importance of homiletics in the education of seminarians and the necessity of making homiletics a practical science, if pastors of souls are to profit by its study. He found that the greatest difficulty for young preachers lies in the popularization of the rich contents of our holy religion. Therefore, he not only teaches the theory of homiletics, but he also puts his teaching into practical form by bidding his pupils go to first sources, Holy Scripture, liturgy and theology for matter, and then shows them how to do it. He intends that the book shall serve as a class manual and also as a sermon storehouse. It must not be thought of as a sermon book in the ordinary sense, made up of a collection of sermons which may be preached as they stand. It is rather an analysis of subjects, with suggestions and directions that will enable the preacher to produce a sermon. It has received the highest commendations in the original German and has run through several editions, and it should have a corresponding degree of popularity in English.

INNOCENT XI. Sa Correspondance avec Ses Nonces 21 Septembre, 1676—31 Decembre, 1679. *F. de Bojani.* Premiere Partie: Affaires Politiques. Seconde Partie: Affaires Ecclesiastiques et le Gouvernement de Rome. Rome: Decleé et Cie.

We have had biographies of Innocent XI, and monographs on particular important events of his reign; the correspondence of

ambassadors and other representatives of Louis XIV. at the Court of Rome have also been published; but now for the first time the correspondence of the Pope with his nuncios at the different courts sees the light. Until Leo XIII. threw open the Vatican Archives this was not possible. The first two volumes contains the Pope's letters from the time of his election September 21, 1676, to the end of 1679. Other volumes are to follow.

The historical value of these letters is very great. The comparatively long reign of Innocent XI., his great sanctity and zeal, the stormy times in which he lived, and especially his conflicts with Louis XIII., give to them a particular historical value which is much increased by the fact that they correct and complete the history of the period.

The work is really indispensable for all public and institutional libraries.

THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. Parts I. and II. 22. 1.-LXXIV. Literally translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. 8vo., cloth, each, net, $2.00. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We hope that the appearance of Part II. so promptly indicates an encouraging reception of Part I. and an appreciation worthy of the work. The English Dominicans cannot be praised too highly for their courage in resolving to give the great Summa to the English-speaking world. There can be no question as to the wisdom of such a decision, for the English-speaking world needs it badly. Those who doubted if the translation could be made in a satisfactory manner, and if the charm and accuracy of the original could be preserved, need doubt no longer, for these two volumes set all such questions at rest. We hope that the work will be continued and completed as soon as possible, for it is a notable achievement in the theological world.

THE EVE OF CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION. Being the History of the English Catholics During the First Thirty Years of the Nineteenth Century. By *Monsignor Bernard Ward.* With portraits and other illustrations. In three volumes, 8vo. Vols. I. and II.—1803-1820, $6.00, net; Vol. III.—1820-1829, $3.75, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This volume brings to completion an important historical work, and at the same time, taken in conjunction with two other books that preceded it, closes the history of a period in England fraught with events of great interest to the Catholic world. "The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner" (1691-1781), in two volumes, by Edwin H. Burton, began this history; "Dawn of the Catholic Re-

vival in England" (1781-1803), in two volumes, by Monsignor Ward, continued it, and the "Eve of Catholic Emancipation" (1803-1829), in three volumes, by the same author, completes it. Monsignor Ward's share of the work was very great, covering the period between 1781 and 1829 and filling five large volumes. The work is admirably done in every way, and it seems almost a presumption to say so when speaking of a man so well known as the author. Its value is acknowledged without question, and its interest is sustained throughout.

THE CAMBRIDGE MANUALS OF SCIENCE AND LITERATURE. Bound in rose-colored art cloth. 1s., net, per volume. Or, in brown leather, 2s. 6d., net, per volume. $0.40, net. Cambridge University Press, C. F. Clay, manager. London: Fetter Lane, E. C. Edinburgh: 100 Princess street. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

A series of small volumes on literary and scientific subjects dealing with various aspects of thought and with the results of recent discoveries, in a form acceptable to educated readers in general. Under the editorship of P. Giles, Litt. D., and A. C. Seward, M. A., F. R. S. These manuals treat of such subjects as archæology, ethnology, history, music, philosophy, poetry, aviation, botany, geology, physics, psychology, zoölogy.

The authors are carefully chosen because of their special fitness, and the result is a very attractive series which is still growing. The books appeal to several classes of persons. They are excellent for beginners, giving a satisfactory, brief treatise of the subject under consideration and encouraging to further study; they are useful for review, bringing back in outline what has been already learned in extenso; they are serviceable in a supplemental way, because they bring a subject up to date which perhaps is known only imperfectly.

The convenient size in which they are made tempts one to slip them into the pocket or bag, and is in itself an incentive to study.

PSALTERIUM ROMANUM BREVIARII ROMANI. 12mo., 16mo., 48mo., $0.70, $0.80, $1.00 and $1.10, according to binding. St. Louis: B. Herder.

These are the publications of Desclee & Co. and arranged in sizes to match the various editions of their breviary. The 16mo. is printed from very clear type, on opaque India paper of excellent resistance, and it makes a book unusually well adapted for combination with the breviary when traveling.

The reliability and convenience of the liturgical publications of this firm are too well known to need comment. It is only necessary to say that their psalters are up to their usual standard.

PERIODICAL

70769

70769

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE